DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 465 TE 001 776

AUTHOR Visovatti, Kathleen
TITLE The Approaches to English Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Elk Grove Training and Development Center, Arlington Heights, Ill.; Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill. Curriculum Center in English.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.
PUB DATE Jun 69
NOTE 99p.
AVAILABLE FROM NCTE/ERIC, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61820 (hard copy, on lcan only)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques, *English Instruction, *Inservice Teacher Education, *Leadership Training, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Behavior, *Teacher Improvement, Teacher Participation, Teacher Programs, Teacher Seminars
IDENTIFIERS ESEA Title 3

ABSTRACT

Funded under a Title 3, ESEA Grant, this project for the study and demonstration of methods and materials for teaching English was a cooperative effort between the Curriculum Center in English at Northwestern University and the Elk Grove Training and Development Center (Arlington Heights, Illinois). The major focus of the project was the facilitating of teacher growth and subsequent classroom changes. Teachers were placed in seminar settings where they were encouraged to participate in self-determined and self-directed programs. Individual teachers were helped (on either a personal, small group, or total group basis) to inquire into a problem they had undertaken and to engage in the necessary reorganization of attitudes for behavioral change in the classroom. Evaluations indicated that the main objectives of the program--(1) to guide participants to increased knowledge of English, (2) to facilitate the modification of teacher attitudes and classroom behavior, and (3) to train participants for leadership roles in in-service programs in their schools--were successfully met. (Appendices include syllabi for the seminars and evaluation forms with results.) [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.])Author/LH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OE/BESE
Title III

ED037465

Prepared by:

Kathleen Visovatti, Coordinator

The Approaches to English Program
Final Report

for

The Elk Grove Training and Development Center
E.S.E.A. Title III
1706 West Algonquin Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Gloria Kinney, Director

and

The Curriculum Center in English
Northwestern University
1809 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201

June 1969

TE001776

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM. . . . . 1 - 4

RATIONALE. 5 - 10

PURPOSE. .11 - 19

ACTIVITIES . . . . .20 - 23

EVALUATION . . . . .24 - 33

A. Formative Evaluation . . . . .24 - 25

B. Summative Evaluation . . . . .25 - 31

C. Recommendations. . . . . .32 - 33

REFERENCES 34

ABSTRACT .35

APPENDICES

INDEX OF TABLES

TABLE I - t-test Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test for the Educational Practices and Ideas: Attitude Survey 27

TABLE II - t-test Comparison of Approaches to English Group and an Outside Control Group for Illinois Test In The Teaching of English-Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition-Inventory of Teaching Practices. 28

TABLE III - Content Analysis of Interview With Schedule. 29

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

Approaches to English

In cooperation with the Northwestern University Curriculum Center in English, ESEA, Title XI, the Elk Grove Training and Development Center, ESEA, Title III, sponsored an in-service training program for English teachers, K-12, of the northwest suburban area of Chicago. The program, entitled APPROACHES TO ENGLISH...A Study and Demonstration of Methods and Materials in the Teaching of English, was composed of, ultimately, four teacher training programs in seminar settings, three of which utilized released-time for participants.

Two programs were implemented in 1967-68:

Independent Study in Action Research provided experienced teachers with released-time on a half-time basis for the school year. They used this time for in-depth reading and study, program planning, development of in-service programs for their own (and other) schools, and developing teaching materials. Some of their work was done at the Northwestern Curriculum Center in English; much of it was done in the schools or at home. These teachers also served as resource persons and discussion leaders for the other training programs described below.

Symposium on the Language Arts brought together new, experienced and student teachers, K-12, to study methodology and materials related to the teaching of English. These participants were released from teaching duties for half a day twice monthly throughout the school year to attend the symposiums. They discussed current issues and problems, and considered new methods and materials in the field.

The Independent Study and Symposium Programs continued in 1968-69. In addition, two more programs were implemented.

Symposium II composed of 25 veterans of Symposium I, continued their study and, in addition, considered ways of establishing in-service programs in their own schools. They were released from teaching duties for half a day twice monthly to attend the symposiums.

Finally, Seminar for Supervisors involved English coordinators, curriculum directors and department chairmen from area districts in monthly dinner meetings to consider their mutual problems with in-service and supervision and to survey trends in the field of English.

Personnel

Producers - The Approaches to English Model Program was a cooperative of interests, resources and monies between the Northwestern Curriculum Center in English and The Elk Grove Training and Development Center. Therefore, the Associate Director of The Curriculum Center, Dr. Stephen N. Judy, and the T & D Model Program Coordinator, Mrs. Kathleen Visovatti, co-directed the program.

Secretarial responsibilities were performed by Mrs. Catherine Ekkebus of the T & D staff during the developmental stage of the program, March-August, 1967. Mrs. Jeanne Howe of the T & D staff served as the program secretary during its first year of implementation, September 1967-August 1968. Mrs. Ann Kramer of the T & D staff was the program's secretary in its second and final year of operation, September 1968-June 1969.

Numerous consultants, from the Northwestern University Curriculum Center and Training and Development staffs, from cooperating agencies and universities of the area and from educational institutions throughout the country, assisted the co-directors with the program during its two years of operation by serving as resource personnel to both participants and staff. (See Appendix D)

Consumers

1967-68

Independent Study Program - 10 experienced teachers from the consortium, (ten cooperating school districts in the northwest suburban area) representing 5 districts, 9 schools, 5 grade levels.

Symposium I - 50 new and experienced teachers from the consortium, representing 7 districts, 31 schools, 12 grade levels.

1968-69

Independent Study Program - 4 experienced teachers from the consortium, representing 4 districts, 4 schools, 4 grade levels.

Symposium I - 41 new and experienced teachers and supervisors from the area, representing 7 public school and 2 parochial school districts, 25 schools, 12 grade levels.

Symposium II - 29 experienced teachers from the area, representing 7 districts, 17 schools, 11 grade levels.

Seminar for Supervisors - 28 curriculum directors, Language Arts supervisors and English Department Chairmen from the area, representing 15 districts.

Location

Both Training and Development and Northwestern University Centers housed human and material resources for the program and were the sites of the offices of the co-directors, Dr. Judy at Northwestern University, Mrs. Visovatti at the Training and Development Center.

Participants in the Independent Study Program met at the Curriculum Center for individual study and seminar.

The 1967-68 Symposium sessions were held in the Conference Room at the Training and Development Center.

The 1968-69 Symposium I and II sessions met in the classrooms of Faith Lutheran Church, Arlington Heights, Illinois.

The Seminar for Supervisors met in a private room at the Holiday Inn, Rolling Meadows, Illinois.

Curriculum

The content of the program was that of new attitudes, methods. and materials in the teaching of English with an emphasis on the teacher as a resource, the classroom as a creative workshop and the student as the determiner of what he learns and how he can learn it best.

RATIONALE

Background and History

Since 1962 there has been a revival of interest in the teaching of English as a result of English curriculum projects funded by the U. S. Office of Education and new materials prepared by commercial publishers. Little, however, has been done to develop effective teaching procedures and to prepare teachers for the new learning materials. The majority of in-service training programs and summer institutes have focused somewhat narrowly on the subject matter preparation of teachers. It seems to have been assumed that if a teacher masters the content of the "New English"-- new grammars, new rhetorics, and new schema of literary criticism -- he is fully prepared to deal with his students in new ways. But clearly, new materials imply new methods; the imposition of old teaching patterns on fresh content creates more problems than it solves.

The program described in this report attempted to join student materials, teaching methods, and a system of professional development into a coordinated operation which related practically to the participants' classroom and in-service responsibilities. It was assumed by the staff that the teachers who volunteered to participate in the program had already committed themselves to innovative approaches to the English language arts and who had a strong interest in working with other teachers. The approach was thus exploratory rather than remedial, allowing teachers to move into new areas of experimentation in classroom teaching and in-service training, rather than stressing "gaps" in their preparation as teachers. The program served as a model of in-service education. Participants worked together in laboratory situations, experimenting broadly in a relatively unstructured atmosphere to clarify attitudes, increase knowledge and develop skills as classroom teachers and in-service leaders.

The nature and function of the program served as a suggested model for the participants' own classroom: a creative language arts workshop was featured; sessions were relatively unstructured, and the teachers were offered a variety of activities based on their expressed interests; feedback was encouraged at every session and the data collected determined the content and form of succeeding meetings.

This student-centered, experience-based, freely structured approach, as described by such writers as Sybil Marshall [1], J. W. Patrick Creber [2], David Holbrook [3], Herbert Kohl [4], John Holt [5], and James Moffett [6] assumes that the development of so-called "language arts skills" is largely a natural or intuitive process. When a child is deeply and honestly engaged in exploring his own and others' experience in words, both his "power over language" and his own personal growth are accelerated. Language skills are developed as a reflection of the child's ability to deal with his experience. The approach sees all children as creative beings, capable of dealing positively and constructively with their lives. The function of the teacher thus becomes that of catalyst and consultant. He does not dominate or dictate to the class, he is a resource person, not an "instructor."

No one knows very much yet about how children can best learn to produce and receive language or what the exact stages of an optimal learning sequence would be. Why, then, attempt to delineate a program of the language arts, student-centered or not? And what proof backs up the many assumptions and assertions made in this report?

The fact is that language instruction goes on and will go on, evidence or no evidence. On what proof rests the teaching that is taking place at this very moment?

> Though many teaching materials claim to be backed by scientific evidence, in actuality there are very few classroom practices that have such backing. Educational research itself is notorious for both inadequate methodology and the verdict of "no significant difference" in its findings. The cry is for better methodology, but truly scientific experiments in the classroom may simply be impossible; controlling variable factors, without converting the school into an unreal laboratory, presents a virtually insoluble problem. And when university research in child development and learning theory is conducted rigorously enough to be reliable, the findings are usually trivial for education; when the findings result in a broad, suggestive and stimulating theory, it seldom gains acceptance beyond one "school of thought" in the discipline. Thus educators can choose B. F. Skinner's "reinforcement" theory of learning as embodied in programmed materials or the very different "discovery" theory as promulgated by Jerome Bruner and others. The theories of the leading figure in child development, Jean Piaget, are disputed; even when scholars and researchers embrace them, they acknowledge that the theories have not been empirically proven in accordance with rigorous research standards and may in fact not be susceptible to scientific verification at all. Though scientific research sometimes helps make decisions when all other things are equal, it has not so far furnished big answers and may never be able to do so.
>
> In any case, of course, education cannot simply wait on research. Pending more knowledge, if it is to come, teachers have to go on making decisions about what to do and not to do, how to do and when to do. We make the decisions on several bases--practical experience, intuition, definitions of goals, and theories about language, literature and composition that do not purport to be pedagogical but are attractive for one reason or another...By skillfully citing various studies and

> authorities, one could back up [virtually any program.] Research findings and scholarly theories exist to support a host of opposing practices...[7]

Therefore, this report does not attempt to justify the program through scholarly citations.

The exceptions are the considerably negative findings about teaching grammar [8], ignored by most commercial publishing houses - and school systems [9], and a general research indication that beginning reading fares best when launched by an early, systematic, and intensive instruction in sound-spelling correspondences, and indication reflected in all new reading programs appearing in the 1960's, as well as recent revisions of older programs [10].

In summary, what is determining teaching practices in English is not scientific evidence but historical accident, unproven conventions, abstractly logical conceptions of the field, and intellectually attractive theories about it that were not originally conceived for teaching purposes at all. Two examples follow:

The first is that a chronological-critical teaching of literature happens to be the tradition of university English departments and has produced English majors who know virtually nothing about the vast field of language and discourse besides literary periods and influences.

> There is a radical...separation between subject matter and technique. On the one side are academic or subject matter specialists....On the other side, across some organizational tracks, are specialists in the curious rites of something called teaching. The former provide what is to be taught. The latter provide the psychological know-how on the basis of which teachers are expected to "motivate" children to learn.
>
> Why there need be such a separation is not very clear; for surely children, in natural circumstances, do quite a lot of learning on their own, when they want to or need to [11].

In all university colleges and many independent ones too, work in English is designed as preparation for graduate work, or at least is so nearly a replication of graduate work as to have the effect of being a preparation for it. And the English graduates turn right around and teach the subject as they were taught. Only 2% of our public school students will eventually become English majors. What about the other 98%?

A second historical detriment to English curriculum is that just as educational research was discrediting grammer teaching there came along the discipline of linguistics that English educators felt must somehow be the godsend they needed to launch a New English like the New Math or New Physics, and to placate the critics who were claiming that after 12 years of studying English students had little to show for it.

Linguistics filled the bill to establish the post-Sputnic age of "intellectual rigor." By a deft switch of rationale we could now go on teaching grammar, not as an aid to speaking and writing (massive evidence forbade that) but as an intellectual discipline to develop the mind.

In the uncertainties of how to teach an extremely difficult subject, we too readily drag down university disciplines into elementary and secondary school. In the case of grammar, this tendency is reinforced by the irrational hold that grammar has on the curriculum because of a long-standing tradition revered by the public perhaps more than the profession.

This is not a criticism of linguistics itself but of its inclusion in the language arts curriculum. Analyses of grammars may increase the teacher's understandings of what he is trying to teach and help him see how best to go about teaching it, but to teach them directly to his students, or to base exercises on them in the "discovery" manner, is misguided, for this effort to transmit the generalities of scholarship almost always ends by forcing on students an arbitrary and therefore unwelcome knowledge, and by forcing out of the curriculum much more meaningful learning activities.

Very little of current teaching is based on research evidence or scientific proof [12]. If this program is no more founded on research evidence than any other, how does it recommend itself? First, a direct or naturalistic approach in which students learn essentially by doing and getting feedback on what they have done, embodies the safest assumption about learning according to such authors as John Dewey [13], Jerome Bruner[14], and Hilda Taba [15]. Much general experience supports this assumption in other areas of life [16]. If the goals of the curriculum are to help learners think, speak, listen, read and write to the limits of their capacities, then the most reasonable premise is that they should do exactly those things.

> "It is in education more than anywhere else that we have sincerely striven to carry into execution,'The Great American Dream': the vision of a longer and fuller life for the ordinary man, a life of widened freedom, of equal opportunity for each to make of himself all that he is capable of becoming." [17]

PURPOSE

We are in a period of profound change. The changes stem from powerful and sometimes irrational pressures to do things differently, and from the invention of new instructional devices and materials. Teachers are often required to take on innovations which call neither for understanding nor for accepting the rationale of the innovation. In effect, a change is often pursued for its own sake. If we are to avoid simply substituting a new bad tradition for an old, teachers need time to investigate assumptions which lie beneath new programs.

But not only the new deserves scrutiny. Inservice education has been largely a matter of transmitting to the teacher one gospel or another. The inservice education record is for the most part a story of teacher institutes, opening day inspirational messages, workshops designed to indoctrinate the teacher toward a particular point of view, and university extension courses required periodically enforced by the threat of salary loss.

Teachers have been inundated with prescriptions for proper pedagogical behavior. However, the desire to change, if it is to be consequential, must come from within the individual teacher himself. Mediocre teaching can distill and even pollute the value of everything that goes on in the classroom. Nothing that we invent in the way of content or method will be worth very much unless it is used competently. And because it is virtually impossible to teach a class so badly that no learning takes place, survival has been easy, but the price of ease has been the inhibition of experimentation. [18]

Thus, the purpose of this program was to facilitate teacher growth and the resultant classroom changes. The approach was predominantly human, heavily committed to the growth of the individual in the hopes of ensuring rational change that would generate professional growth in the teacher as a necessary precondition to better schools.

The teacher's classroom attitudes and behaviors are partly a result of notions gained during his training and partly a result of his teaching experience. He begins to grow when he becomes dissatisfied with his performance and seeks a greater understanding and control of the classroom events. Growth, in effect, extends his accumulated knowledge. It goads him into a mastery of more sophisticated skills and techniques and a more perceptive grasp of the subtleties which exist in the interaction of himself and his students. To accomplish this, he engages in a sort of cyclical process - more intuitive than deliberate - in which he identifies a teaching problem, tentatively diagnosis the required action, selects from among his alternative methods the one which seems most appropriate, tests the adequacy of the method, modifies it as required, tests it again, and then uses the resulting evidence to reorganize his understanding. [19]

But mastery of this sort can not be applied to the teacher like a fine polish. He can acquire it only through a self-directed effort. Therefore, the program provided an authentic opportunity for the teachers to explore ideas in which they were genuinely interested and in which their efforts were subsidized in necessary ways.

In a seminar setting, participants and staff created a support system. The essence of the seminar task was to assist teachers to exploit their own potential in self-determined and self-directed programs of growth. First, the co-directors used discrepant events, incongruities and simple dissonances as sponsors of motivation and incentive. This initial function was to draw attention to a problem affecting all that could be dealt with, if not resolved. Next, the directors attempted to create and sustain the conditions necessary for growth. Here they became a source of external support. They provided time and means. Released-time was available to work intensively with the teachers, and funds were provided with which to procure materials, expert advice and other resources. The third dimension of the program as an instrument of professional growth was assisting the teachers to put improvements into practice and to measure their consequences. On a one-to-one, small group, or total group basis, individual teachers were helped to inquire into a problem they had undertaken, and to engage in the necessary reorganization of attitudes, and ultimately to modify behavior in the classroom.

Objectives of the Model Program

An examination of the objectives of the program (and the activities and transactions designed to accomplish the objectives) as originally formulated and the subsequent changes and additions made may indicate a rational and cumlative growth in technical proficiency, pedagogical artistry and a clearer understanding of learning on the part of the co-directors of the program. In short, they were engaged in a long, arduous struggle to upgrade their professional talents! (See Part V, Section C, Recommendations).

The following listings of objectives are taken from the program description, prepared yearly by the directors of the Approaches to English Program to provide information for the vital written component of the Training and Development Center's internal evaluation program.

1966-67 - Developmental Stage of the Approaches to English Program

Instructional Objectives in Student Behavioral Terms

I. Teacher-participants will define and develop a list of the basic aims of English teaching

II. Teacher-participants will investigate areas of the existing English curriculum and:

  A. Choose one or more areas of interest

  B. Read existing literature and survey available materials relevant to those interest areas

  C. Modify these existing materials to individual classroom situations

  D. Create original lesson materials for use in their own classrooms

  E. Experiment in their own classes to determine the worth of those materials developed in C and D above

III. Teacher-participants will disseminate by:

  A. Demonstrating the utilization of those materials in the classroom to fellow participants in the Approaches to English Program and visiting English teachers from the consortium.

IV. Teacher-participants will take an ever-increasing leadership role in:

  A. Conducting the Symposium

    1. Organizing its meetings

    2. Developing its agenda

  B. Supervising the use of teacher-produced lesson materials in consortium classrooms

Ultimately students will profit from the training of their teachers. They will be:

- I. Enrolled in classrooms using teacher-produced materials
- II. Enrolled in classes which are demonstration centers for inside and outside visitors.
- III. Attain a significant increase in interest as an experimental group in those areas which teachers will choose to develop in their inservice activities
- IV. Show a significant increase in interest in the various areas developed by their teachers as determined by the evaluative procedures which the involved teachers will have established.

The above were laboriously written in behavioral terms and then greatly modified once the program became operational, as the real needs of the participants were voiced and acted upon. Thus, the objectives were changed.

1967-68 - First Year of Operation of the Approaches to English Program

- I. To help the participants develop a comprehensive "philosophy" for the teaching of English, including:
    - A. the overall goals of education, and the relationships of the teaching of English to them,
    - B. purposes of teaching English in the schools,
    - C. an understanding of the meaning of "structure", "sequence", and "increment" as they apply to English,
    - D. justification for inclusion of the components language, literature and composition,
    - E. a concept of the "structure" of the discipline as it applies to students and classroom activities.
- II. To introduce participants to "new trends" in the disciplines

of English:

- A. in linguistics: recent developments and studies in the history of language, the nature and function of language, and grammar,
- B. in rhetoric: the "new" rhetorics, the revival of classical rhetoric, and the rejection of traditional classroom rhetorics,
- C. in literary criticism: developments in critical theory in the twentieth century - new criticism, psychological criticism, mythic or generic criticism.

III. To help the participants relate new trends in the disciplines to the purposes of teaching English in the schools and to the "real" needs of their students:

- A. in language: the inductive method, the value of the new grammars, the value of study in general semantics, dialectology, history of the language, and general linguistic theory.
- B. in composition: relating speaking and writing, teaching the writing process, leading students in the study of "rhetoric", and applying "rhetoric" in the light of current knowledge about language and language learning.
- C. in literature: criticism and the philosophies behind thematic and generic units, the examination of individual works, free reading programs, and individualized reading.

IV. To introduce the teachers to new teaching materials in English:

- A. in language: Project English materials from Oregon, Nebraska, Minnesota, Georgia, and new "linguistically oriented" textbook series.

B. in composition: Project English materials from Oregon, Nebraska, Florida, Georgia, Northwestern and relevant commercial texts.

C. in literature: Project English materials from Oregon, Nebraska, Purdue, Hunter, Carnegie Tech, Euclid.

V. To encourage participants to adapt relevant materials for their own classes and to provide them with assistance in writing original lessons.

VI. To encourage participants to lead innovative programs in their own schools and districts and to provide them with as much assistance as possible in such programs.

The above were revised after the first year of operation because the program was not as effective as the directors had anticipated and because their orientation had shifted from that of content to that of process. The program emerged in its second and final year of operation people-oriented and consequently relatively unstructured.

1968-69 - Second Year of Operation of the Approaches to English Program

Overall goals:

1) To help participants determine personal behavioral objectives for the teaching of English
2) To encourage implementation of those objectives in the classroom
3) To assist participants in the assessment of those objectives once implemented

Specific goals:

1) To guide participants to increased knowledge in the field of English

2) To facilitate the change of teacher attitudes and behaviors in the classroom

3) To train participants for leadership roles in in-service programs in their schools

Relation of the Model Program to the Basic Questions of T & D

In summary, the Approaches to English Program evolved as a training program committed to the Basic Questions of T & D. The staff and participants of the program have become increasingly willing to expose and study, openly and objectively, their own behavior as a result of their involvement in the program. This came about because of the support nature of the seminar setting and the facilitating role adopted by the directors. A caring culture was established in which individuals could experiment and share because they accepted and trusted one another. The activities suggested were means to an end -- vehicles, in effect, for professional growth. As a result, the participants felt free to intellectualize and then internalize changes in their role perceptions of teachers, students and in-service leaders. They came to believe in and, in varying degrees, to create a classroom setting that was student-centered, experience-based and freely structured. The function of the teacher thus became, again in varying degrees, that of catalyst rather than director, consultant more than instructor, facilitator, not controller. They came to see, in degrees, all children as creative beings, capable of dealing positively and constructively with their lives. And because the nature and function of the training program served as a suggested model for the participants' own classrooms, their view of in-service education and the role of the in-service leader was modified accordingly. The specific skills the participants were introduced to and had an opportunity to practice included suggested methods for individualizing instruction, techniques of self-assessment, and strategies to facilitate change in reality settings.

The learning outcomes implied in the above paragraph for teachers related directly to the learning outcomes of students in that the approach of the program focused on a student-centered, experienced-based, freely structured atmosphere in which students learn essentially by doing and getting feedback on what they have done, an approach which embodies the safest assumption about learning. [20] A student-centered curriculum is a teacher-training curriculum in that it offers an opportunity for teachers to learn from and for students.

ACTIVITIES

Program Development and Training Activities and Techniques

The Approaches to English Program provided a learning environment for adults who were classroom teachers and in-service leaders. Although the participant population varied from year to year and group to group, the emphasis with all was to provide a safe setting in which participants could assess their choices of content and patterns of behavior in the classroom. Each training session attempted to proceed from the needs of participants, suggest ideas for experimentation in the classroom and provide resources for follow-up. The general content of the program was that of new attitudes, methods and materials in the teaching of English with an emphasis on the teacher as a resource, the classroom as a creative workshop and the student as the determiner of what he learns and how he can learn it best.

The co-directors developed the specific curriculum for these programs, all of which met in seminar settings, according to the concerns and interests of the participants which were determined at the initial session of each group through a discussion and a needs assessment questionnaire. Program schedules and syllabi are contained in Appendi A and B. The curriculum was modified in the course of each year by the suggestions of the participants, offered verbally or on feedback forms. See Appendix C.

To facilitate the process of dealing with these participant-determined topics, various group techniques were used. Generally, a topic was considered by the total group during the first half of the session with in-put provided by a staff member(s) from the Northwestern Curriculum Center or Training and Development Center or a consultant. See Appendix D.

Sometimes a participant would provide the input. Each presentation (informal lecture or demonstration) was designed to maximize participant involvement. Comments and questions were encouraged throughout this activity. The presentation/discussion was followed by small group sessions, based on special-interests. A flexible format permitted both task and process orientations, depending upon each small group's needs.

Together, participants and staff created a support system. The essence of the seminar task was to assist teachers to exploit their own potential in self-determined and self-directed programs of growth. First, the co-directors used discrepant events, incongruities and simple dissonances as sponsors of motivation and incentive. This initial function was to draw attention to a problem affecting all that could be dealt with, if not resolved. Next, the directors attempted to create and sustain the conditions necessary for growth. Here they became a source of external support. They provided time and means. Released-time was available to work intensively with the teachers, and funds were provided with which to procure materials, expert advice and other resources. The third dimension of the program as an instrument of professional growth was assisting the teachers to put improvements into practice and to measure their consequences. On a one-to-one, small group, or total group basis, individual teachers were helped to inquire into a problem they had undertaken, and to engage in the necessary reorganization of attitudes, and ultimately to modify behavior in the classroom.

Dissemination and Consulting Activities and Techniques

Dissemination activities of the Approaches to English Program were designed to 1) recruit participants and secure administrative support, and 2) publicize the results of teacher involvement in the Program. Techniques to facilitate the former included a) letters to superintendents, curriculum directors, language arts supervisors, department chairmen and principals in the consortium, describing the nature and mechanics of the Program; b) informal tea invitations to interested teachers in the consortium, designed to acquaint potential participants with the Program; c) follow-up telephone calls and/or letters to those administrators and teachers who indicated a desire to be involved in the program; d) a brochure to all schools in the consortium announcing the components of the Program and describing the objectives of each. The above were disseminated in the spring of each year.

Techniques publicizing the results of teacher involvement in the Program included a) articles in the Northwestern Curriculum and Training and Development Centers' Newsletters describing the activities of the four training programs and the various projects of individuals within them, mailed to over 4,000 individuals connected with educational institutions throughout the country; b) the Approaches to English Program Description (see Appendix B) displayed at educational meetings and conventions throughout the state and sent to any individual or institution requesting "English" information of the T & D Center; c) participant-produced instructional materials and research studies, distributed to teachers in the Program and available in numbers to consortium districts upon request; d) video-tapes of demonstration classes by teacher-participants and presentations by consultants at Approaches to English sessions, available on loan to consortium districts upon request.

Consulting services were made available upon the request of the consumer, usually a participant in the Program requesting services on behalf of his school or district. Staff members of the Northwestern and T & D Centers and selected participants in the Approaches to English Program worked as teams. Some examples of the services they provided included work with local curriculum study groups, textbook selection committees, team-teaching teams, department chairmen, steering committees, and English departments. The approach in every case was that of assisting the consumer group to determine its goals based on the needs of its target population and to provide resources, both human and material, to facilitate the accomplishment of those goals. Confrontation and problem-solving techniques were utilized.

The purpose of all the activities and techniques described above was to facilitate teacher growth and the resultant classroom changes. The approach was predominately human, heavily committed to the growth of the individual in the hopes of ensuring rational change that would generate professional growth in the teacher as a necessary precondition to better schools.

EVALUATION

Formative Evaluation

The formative evaluation of The Approaches to English Program was developed predominately during the second year of operation. The first year of the program was a developmental year in terms of program emphasis and objectives.

Formative data were gathered using the following:

1) pre and post measures of educational attitudes and behaviors
2) numerical objective scales of participant reaction to seminar sessions
3) evaluative discussions based upon the feedback forms provided at the end of each session
4) verbal feedback by individual participants during the seminar sessions
5) the yearly outside evaluation report
6) personal observations on the part of coordinators

The formative evaluation feedback suggested the need for some restructuring of The Approaches to English Program. Paramount in these revisions were those directed toward changing the emphasis from that of material and methodological approaches to the teaching of English to a focus upon the role perceptions of the teacher participants. It became clear from the formative data that methodological and material skills and understandings were not transferring to the participants so that changes in actual classroom performance was evidenced.

A shift from content emphasis for the total group of participants to small group interaction sessions dealing with the specific concerns and interests of the group members occurred. The role of the learner in the classroom received increased emphasis by actively involving the participants in the activities of the program, replacing the relatively passive participant role of audience to lectures and demonstrations. Specific examples are described in the section of the report dealing with program activities (See Activities Section).

Another alteration resulted from the paucity of formative data during the first year that could be analyzed for program strengths and weaknesses. A concerted evaluative effort was extended the second year through planned data gathering for formative purposes (See Appendix C for examples of instruments used).

Summative Evaluation

The summative evaluation of the program focused on the areas of training and the institutionalization of ideas related to the teaching of English. The basic questions investigated pertained to the following:

1) Was there a change in the educational attitudes of program participants after involvement in The Approaches to English Program?
2) Was there a difference in the teaching behaviors of those involved in the program and those who were not?
3) Was an increase in English content knowledge acquired by the participants in the course of their involvement in the program?
4) What effects did the program participants have upon the broad educational community while they were involved in the program?

Operations

Registration forms and participant lists are provided in Appendix C. Copies of the instruments used are also included.

The Educational Practices and Ideas: Attitude Survey, designed by members of the T & D Center Evaluation Team was given to those program participants who were involved in The Approaches to English Program for two years (Symposium II members) and to that population of participants who were involved the last year only (Symposium I members). The survey was administered to both groups in September, 1968 (the first seminar session of the year), and again in May, 1969,(the last seminar session of the year).

To ascertain behavioral change, the Illinois Test in the Teaching of English, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition, designed by ISCPET, was administered to a random sample of one and two year veterans of the program and a random sample of non-participants responsible for teaching English. The inventory was administered to both groups in April, 1969.

In an effort to determine increased content knowledge and effects upon the educational community served by program participants, an interview with schedule was employed. The schedule, developed by the T & D coordinator was based upon the program's specific objectives and was given to those teachers who participated in the Independent Study in Action Research Programs as well as the Symposium Programs. The interview with schedule was administered in May, 1968 and May, 1969.

A t-test for significance between means was applied to the quantitative data derived from the pre and post test scores of the Educational Practices and Ideas: Attitude Survey.

Similarly, a t-test for significance between means was employed with the data derived from the Illinois Test in the Teaching of English, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition.

A content analysis process was used to analyze the interviews with schedule.

Summary of Findings

In an effort to ascertain changes in the educational attitudes of Symposium participants involved in The Approaches to English Program, a t-test for significance between means was employed using pre and post measures from the Educational Practives and Ideas: Attitude Survey. In Table I the findings are presented.

TABLE I

t-test Comparison of Pre-test and Post test for the Educational Practices and Ideas: Attitude Survey

Pre-test	Post-test
mean ($\bar{x}_1$) = 130	mean ($\bar{x}_2$) = 159
Standard Deviation$_1$ = 14	Standard Deviation$_2$ = 10.5
N_1 = 55	N_2 = 30

df = 83 t = -11.88*

* = significant at the .01 level

To be significant at the .01 level with 83 degrees of freedom, a t-value of -2.64 was required. The t-value of 11.88 was found to be significant at the .01 level. This indicated a significant change in the educational attitudes of Symposium participants after involvement in the program. Caution must be exercised, in interpreting these findings however, due to the attrition rate between pre and post measures.

Table II presents the findings of the t-test for significance between means applied to the mean scores of Approaches to English participants and non-participants in an effort to determine significant differences in teaching behaviors as measured by the Illinois Test In The Teaching Of English, Knowledge and Skill In Written Composition, Inventory of Teaching Practices.

TABLE II

t-test Comparison of Approaches to English Group
and an
Outside Control Group
for
Illinois Test In The Teaching Of English
Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition
Inventory of Teaching Practices

Approaches to English Group	Control Group
Mean ($\bar{x}_1$) = 66.42	Mean ($\bar{x}_2$) = 55.12
Standard Deviation$_1$ = 8.8	Standard Deviation$_2$ = 5.96
N_1 = 45	N_2 = 36

df = 79 t = 6.57*

* = significant at the .01 level

To be significant at the .01 level with 79 degrees of freedom, a t-value of -2.64 was required. The t-value of 6.57 was found to be significant at the .01 level. This indicated that a significant difference did exist between the teaching behaviors of the Approaches to English Program participants and those of non-participants.

In an effort to ascertain increased content knowledge and effect upon the educational community, a content analysis process was employed using the interview with schedule developed by the coordinator. Table III shows the findings. Because the number of respondents was small, the tallied responses are shown in percentages.

TABLE III

Content Analysis of Interview With Schedule

Type of Feedback	Considerably more than expected	More than expected	As Expected	Less than Expected	Unknown
A. Content Knowledge					
first year	14.3	28.6	28.6	14.3	14.3
second year		28.6	71.5		
B. Changes in Teacher Role - Attitudes					
first year	14.3	28.6	57.2		
second year		71.5	14.3		14.3
Behaviors					
first year	14.3	28.6	57.2		
second year		71.5	14.3		14.3
C. Change Agent					
Administrators					
first year		14.3	14.3	14.3	57.2
second year		28.6	14.3	57.2	
Teachers					
first year	14.3	14.3	14.3	28.6	28.6
second year		57.2	28.6		14.3

It can be observed that the first year group was more heterogenous in its performance while the second year group was more homogenous. While 28.6% of the respondents in the first year did not meet the expected criteria in the area of increased content knowledge, there were none in the second year. In the category of changed attitudes and behaviors, both groups met the expected criteria, with the exception of 14.3% of the second year group. The second year group changed more than the first year group. As change agents, the second year group fared a bit better with administrators, but neither group met the expected criteria in that area; they did have a noticeably greater effect upon their fellow teachers than did their first year counterparts, but neither group met the expected criteria in that area.

As a total group, 85.7% increased their knowledge of content; 92.9% changed their attitudes and behaviors, and 64.3% were effective change agents with teachers, 35.3% with administrators.

Conclusions based on data

The basic questions investigated pertained to the following:

1) Was there a change in the educational attitudes of program participants after involvement in the Approaches to English Program?
2) Was there a difference in the teaching behaviors of those involved in the program and those who were not?
3) Was an increase in English content knowledge acquired by the participants in the course of their involvement in the program?
4) What effects did the program participants have upon the broad educational community while they were involved in the program?

Based on the findings reported, the following conclusions appeared warranted.

1) There was a significant change in the educational attitudes of those involved in the Approaches to English Program as measured by the Educational Practices and Ideas: Attitude Survey.
2) There was a significant difference in the teaching behaviors of those involved in the program from a random sample of teachers not involved in the Approaches to English Program as measured by the Illinois Test In The Teaching Of English, Knowledge and Skill In Written Composition, Inventory of Teaching Practices.
3) Participants did increase their knowledge of content in the course of their involvement in the program as measured by the interview with schedule.
4) Participants did not meet the expected criteria as change agents with administrators and teachers as measured by the interview with schedule; however, 64.3% of them were effective with teachers and 35.3% with administrators.

The findings reported above relate to the basic questions of T & D in that the participants in the program were willing to expose and study their behavior, modify their view of in-service education and the role of the in-service leader, practice specific skills, and relate their learning outcomes to the learning outcomes of students, as witnessed by the significant change in teaching attitudes and behaviors on the part of participants after involvement in the program as measured by the three instruments administered.

Recommendations

Based upon the experiences of designing, implementing, and evaluating the Approaches to English Program, the following recommendations are made for future in-service programs of its kind:

1) Pre-service for the coordinator of the program

   including input on the nature of change, conditions which facilitate change; techniques and tools of group development and maintenance; self-assessment systems; evaluative procedures; and opportunities to practice and assess change agentry skills based on the above.

2) Thorough planning in the initial phase of implementation

   including study of existing in-service programs; needs assessment of the target population; establishment of goals based upon those needs; design of evaluative procedures to measure the effectiveness of those goals.

3) Sophisticated selection criteria for participants

   including personal interview with and on-site observation of classroom performance of prospective participants in addition to standard application forms and administrative recommendations to ascertain the attitudes and needs of the teachers and assure their compatibility with the general assumptions of the program.

4) Emphasis on the affective rather than the cognitive domain from the outset

   including utilization of the principles of attitude and behavior change concerned with such factors as surface vs. lasting results of change, verbalized vs. internalized change, externally vs. self-initiated change, individual and group factors contributing to change, passive absorption and acquiring conviction through active participation in the interests of facilitating teacher growth and the resultant classroom changes.

The coordinator will have an opportunity to follow the recommendations listed above in two endeavors: 1) as a director of a 1969-70 institute for 20 urban elementary teachers of children of minority sub-cultures, funded by the Department of Program Development for the Gifted, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Northwestern Curriculum Center in English, and 2) as an in-service coordinator for six, 1969-70 released-time seminars, for 150 English teachers of public and parochial schools, urban and suburban, funded by the Northwestern Curriculum Center in English.

REFERENCES

1. Marshall, Sybil, An Experiment in Education, Cambridge University Press, 1963
2. Creber, J. W. Patrick, Sense and Sensitivity, University of London Press Ltd., 1965
3. Holbrook, David, English for the Rejected, Cambridge University Press, 1965; The Exploring Word, Cambridge University Press, 1967
4. Kohl, Herbert, 36 Children, New American Library, 1967
5. Holt, John, Why Children Fail, Dell Publishing Co., 1964, How Children Learn, Pitman Publishing Corp., 1967
6. Moffett, James, A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13: A Handbook for Teachers, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1968; Teaching the Universe of Discourse, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1968
7. Moffett, James, A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13: A Handbook for Teachers, Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1968, pp.29-30
8. Meckel, H. C., "Research on Teaching Composition and Literature," in N. L. Gage (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching, (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963)
9. "Research in the Teaching of English," National Council of Teaching of English, Vol. 3, No. 1; Spring 1969
10. Chall, Jeanne, Learning to Read: The Great Debate, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967
11. Douglas, Wallace, "On Some Problems in Teacher Education," Northwestern University Curriculum Center in English Newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 1, Feb.1969
12. Corey, Stephen, Action Research to Improve School Practices, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1953
13. Dewey, John, The Child and the Curriculum and School and Society, 1956, U of Chicago Press
14. Bruner, Jerome, The Process of Education, 1960, Harvard
15. Taba, Hilda, Teaching Strategies and Cognitive Functioning in Elementary School Children, San Francisco State College, 1966
16. Morris, William C.,Wingo, Max G., Psychology and Teaching, Scott Foresman, 1962, pp. 34-35
17. Dewey, John, How We Think, Heath Publishing Co., Boston, 1933.
18. Rubin, Louis, "The Nature of Teacher Growth", Center for Coordinated Education, Santa Barbara, California, 1966
19. Op. cit.
20. Dewey, John, The Child and the Curriculum and School and Society, 1956, U of Chicago Press

ABSTRACT

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH. . . A Study and Demonstration of Methods and Materials in The Teaching of English was a cooperative of interests, resources and monies between the Northwestern Curriculum Center in English and The Elk Grove Training and Development Center.

The program offered four in-service training programs, in seminar settings and on released-time, for English teachers, K-12, of consortium schools.

The main objectives of the program were:

1) to guide participants to increased knowledge in the field of English,
2) to facilitate the change of teacher attitudes and behaviors in the classroom, and
3) to train participants for leadership roles in in-service programs in their schools.

The major focus of the program was the facilitation of teacher growth and the resultant classroom changes. The approach was predominately human, heavily committed to the growth of the individual in the hopes of ensuring rational change that would generate professional growth in the teacher as a necessary precondition to better schools.

In a seminar setting, participants and staff created a support system. The essence of the seminar task was to assist teachers to exploit their own potential in self-determined and self-directed programs of growth. On a one-to-one, small group, or total group basis, individual teachers, were helped to inquire into a problem they had undertaken, to engage in the necessary reorganization of attitudes, and ultimately to modify behavior in the classroom.

APPENDIX A

CHRONOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

October, 1966	Funding of T & D
March, 1967	Establishment of the Approaches to English Program in cooperation with NUCCE and employment of a coordinator
April-May, 1967	Design of Program Recruitment of participants
June-August, 1967	Preparation for academic year program
September-May, 1967-68	Symposium on the Language Arts Bi-monthly half-day sessions (Wednesday mornings, 9:00 - 11:30 a.m. Conference Room of T. & D. Center) Independent Study in Action Research Half-time released-time daily (mornings or afternoons, occasional seminars at NUCCE Friday afternoons) Brochure designed and mailed in March Recruitment teas held in April Participant selection for 1968-69 Program made in May Participating districts assumed part of the financial responsibility for the released-time expense of the participants.
June-August, 1968	Coordinator participated in Cerli training program for Specialists of Continuing Education
September-May, 1968-69	Symposium on the Language Arts I Bi-monthly half-day sessions (Wednesday afternoons, 1:00 - 3:30 p.m. Faith Lutheran Church classrooms) Symposium on the Language Arts II Bi-monthly half-day sessions for veterans of 1967-68 Program (Wednesday afternoon, 1:00 - 3:30 p.m. Faith Lutheran Church classrooms) Independent Study in Action Research Half-time released time daily (afternoons, Bi-monthly seminars at NUCCE, Monday afternoons, 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.) Seminar for Supervisors Monthly dinner meetings (Second Wednesday of each month, 5:00 - 9:00, Holiday Inn, Rolling Meadows, Ill.)
June, 1969	Summative Evaluation of Program Preparation for programs in 1969-70 school year for Districts 15, 25, 214 and Sacred Heart of Mary High School at NUCCE

APPENDIX B

Tentative Syllabus
Symposium on the Language Arts

Elk Grove Training and Development Center
Northwestern University Curriculum Center in English

I. The Teaching of English--Past and Present

An Historical Survey of the Teaching of English
English in the Sixties--New Directions
The Components of the Discipline
Basic Issues and Purposes in English Teaching

II. Language and the Student

The Nature of the Communication Situation
Language and Communication
Children and Language Learning
Grammar, Usage, and Language Teaching

Recommended readings:

Albert R. Kitzhaber, "What is English." Paper read at the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English, Dartmouth College, 1966.

"Standards and Attitudes." A collection of papers from the Dartmouth Seminar.

III. Rhetoric and the Composition Class

Writing and Speaking--the Media and their Characteristics
Writing and Reading
Writers on Writing
What Do We Mean by "Rhetoric"?
Rhetoric and Literary Models

Recommended readings:

Lee Frank Lowe, "Writers on Learning to Write," *English Journal*, October, 1964.

"Toward a New Rhetoric," *Journal of the Conference on College Composition and Communication*, October 1963.

IV. Composition and the Writing Process

The Writer and his Audience
Finding Material
Seeing and Describing
Revising and Proofreading
Editing and Evaluating

Recommended readings:

Miriam Wilt, "How Does a Child Learn English."
Dartmouth Seminar

V. Teaching Literature

Our Literary Heritage
Adolescents and Literature
Reading and Literature--a Distinction Without a Difference?
Motivating Reading

Recommended readings:

Daniel Fader, Hooked on Books.

Ben de Mott, "One Last Go." Dartmoutn Seminar.

VI. Examining Literary Works

Literary Criticism and the Classroom
Thematic Units
Analyzing Style
Book Reports, Reviews, and "Reactions"

Recommended readings:

Ronald S. Crane, "Questions and Answers on the Teaching of Literature."

VII. Structuring English

Does English Have a "Structure?"
Correlating Instruction in Literature, Language, and Composition
What Is a Curriculum?

Recommended readings:

Jerome Bruner, The Process of Education

VIII. Sequencing English

What Do We Teach When?

Recommended readings:

Denys Thompson, "Knowledge and Proficiency in English." Dartmouth Seminar.

"What is Continuity in English?" Dartmouth.

IX. New Materials in the Teaching of English

Commercial Texts
Project English Materials
School Curriculum Guides

X. Examination and Demonstration of Materials in the Teaching of Language

XI. Examination and Demonstration of Materials in the Teaching Composition

XII. Examination and Demonstration of Materials in the Teaching Literature

XIII. Writing Instructional Units

Preparing Teaching Materials
What Materials Need to be Written?

XIV. Organizing and Conducting In-Service Education

ELK GROVE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH
SYMPOSIUM I

Syllabus

I. September 18 — "The Teaching of English, Past and Present"

Speakers:
Stephen Judy, Associate Director, The Curriculum Center in English
Gil Tierney, Harper College and The Curriculum Center in English

II. October 2. — "Language, Experience, and the Process of Composing"

Speakers:
Les Davis, Helen Keller School, Hoffman Estates
Gil Tierney
Stephen Judy

III. October 16. — "Creativity in English"

Speakers:
Sr. Junette Morgan, former teacher, Christ the King School, Richland, Washington

IV. October 30. — "Literature, Reading, and Composition"

Speakers:
Michael C. Flanigan, former Director, Euclid (Ohio) English Demonstration Center.
Mrs. Lawana Trout, former Supervisor of Language Arts, Sand Springs, Oklahoma and Assistant Professor of English, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma.

V. November 13. — "What We've Done"

Speakers:
Julia Hohulin, Dwyer School, District 25
Dorothy Schemske, McArthur Jr. High, District 23
Les Davis, Helen Keller Jr. High, District 54
Phyllis Harms, Wheeling High School, District 214

VI. November 26. (Tuesday) — "Language Instruction in the English Program"

Speakers:
Michael Flanigan
Stephen Judy

VII. December 11. — "The Year's Work in English"

Speakers:
Gil Tierney
Michael Flanigan
Stephen Judy

SYLLABUS

Sessions VII - XVIII will consist of one hour of workshop and one hour presentations on some of the following topics:

Writing Instructional Units
The Language and Thought of the Child
Drama in the Classroom
The Journal
Theme Evaluation and the Editorial Conference
Approaches to Literature
Patterns for In-Service Training
Classroom Film-making

Plus: Demonstrations, videotapes, presentation of new materials.

KV/ak

ELK GROVE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH
SYMPOSIUM I

Syllabus

I.	January 8	Formation of special-interest small groups: Changing the Teacher Role Language Development Teaching of English, K-12 Junior High Methods and Materials Elementary Grades Methods and Materials High School Methods and Materials
II.	January 22	Presentation-Discussion: "The Role of Language Instruction in the Schools,"- Steve Judy "Teaching Creative Writing,"-Sr. Junette Morgan "Afro-American Literature in the English Class",-Gil Tierney "An Introduction to Group Process", - Kathie Visovatti Special-interest groups
III.	February 5	"Tell It Like It Is" Dialogue with Representative High School Students
IV.	February 19	"Values and Teaching" Dr. Merrill Harmin, Southern Illinois University
V.	March 5	"Inner-city Students and Curriculum: Relevancy" Brent Jones, CAM Academy of Chicago Special interest workshops: Afro-American Literature in the Classroom Changing the Teacher Role and Values and Teaching Elementary Grades: Creative Methods and Materials Designing a Language Arts Resource Center Junior High Methods and Materials
VI.	March 19	"The Classroom as a Fine Arts Center" Terry Tobias, T & D Coordinator of Fine Arts Program special interest workshops
VII.	April 2	unstructured group discussion (limited attendance due to spring vacation)
VIII.	April 23	"A Rationale for and Models of Self-Assessment" Kathie Visovatti

IX.	May 7	Follow-up to self-assessment presentation "A Look Back and a Step Forward" - Steve Judy and Kathie Visovatti "Show and Tell" Special interest Groups' presentations to total group "Show and Tell"
X.	May 21	Special-interest Groups' presentations to total group Evaluation procedures
XI.	May 28	"Reflections and Refreshments" A party of all Approaches to English Program participants and NU and T & D Centers' Staffs.

KV:ak
4/22/69

ELK GROVE TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT CENTER

NORTHWESTERN CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH

SYMPOSIUM II

TENTATIVE SYLLABUS

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Sept. 25	"What We Are Doing and Are Planning To Do" Informal and formal curriculum development and in-service programs
Oct. 9	"Basic Issues in In-Service Education" The cognitive and affective domains Mel Johnson, coordinator of T & D Center's In-Service in the Affective Domain (Process Observer)
Oct. 23	"Experience, Language, and the Process of Composing" Steve Judy, Northwestern University Les Davis, Helen Keller School, Hoffman Estates Joy Hebert, Northwestern University (Process Observer)
Nov. 6	"Techniques for Value Clarification" Teaching strategies based on value theory by Drs. Harmin and Simon which help the student clarify his own beliefs Fred Miller, coordinator of T & D Center's Strategies for Social Studies (Process Observer)
Nov. 20	"Reading, Literature, and Composing" Mike Flanigan, Northwestern University Mrs. Lawana Trout, Northwestern University (Process Observer)
Dec. 4	"Interpretation of Attitudes and Feelings" Introduction to and practice with a Taba teaching strategy Bill Kakavas, principal of the Park Forest School demonstrating contra-costa materials and Taba Model for Social Studies (Process Observer)
Dec. 18	"The Role of Language Instruction in the English Program" Mike Flanigan, Northwestern University Steve Judy, Northwestern University (Process Observer)

DEVELOPMENT OF IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

Jan. 15	"Who Will be in Your Program?" Identifying target populations

DEVELOPMENT OF IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

Jan. 29	"How Will You Involve Teachers in the Program?" Designing entry strategies
Feb. 11	"What Is Apt to Happen Back Home?" Practicing Entry Strategies through role-playing and simulation techniques
Feb. 26	"Who Will Conduct the Program?" Determining trainers
Mar. 12	"How Can Continuity and Sequence Be Built-in to the Program?" Activities and mechanisms in support of change efforts
Mar. 26	"What Will Be the Design, Content, and Methods of the Program?" Dr. Mel Heller, Loyola University
Apr. 16	"What Is Apt to Happen Back Home?" Practicing content and method activities through role-playing and simulation
Apr. 30	"What Materials and Facilities Will Be Needed?" Appropriate settings, resources, instruments of support and ways to acquire them
May 14	Practice with Strategies of Entry and Operation
May 28	Evaluation of Symposium II and Designs for Follow-up Activities
Sept. 1969	Home-based In-Service Programs Begin!

KV/ak

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH

Symposium II
1969
Second Semester: Revised

January 15	"Changing the Teacher Role" Herbert Kohl tape followed by discussion
January 29	"Afro-American Literature in the English Class" Lawana Trout, Northwestern University Special-interest small groups - Individualized Reading Programs - Creative Drama - In-service programs - Human Relations - Curriculum: Philosophy and Trends
February 11	"Tell It Like It Is" Dialogue with High School Students
February 19	"Values and Teaching" Dr. Merrill Harmin, Southern Illinois University
February 26	"Inner-city Students and Curriculum: Relevancy" Ron Watson, New York Street Academies
March 12	"Problem-Solving Techniques" Ron Hager, T & D Leadership Training Consultant Special-interest groups: -Afro-American Literature in the English Class -Changing the Teacher Role -Creative Drama
March 26	"The Classroom as a Fine Arts Center" Terry Tobias, Coordinator of T & D's Fine Arts Program Special-interest workshops
April 16	"A Rationale for and Models of Self-Assessment" Kathie Visovatti Special-interest workshops
April 30	Follow-up to Self-assessment presentation "A Look Back and a Step Forward" Kathie Visovatti and Steve Judy Evaluation procedures
May 14	"Creative Communication" Observation of a multi-level, multi-media approach Ridgley Jackson, Olive School, District 25
May 28	"Reflections and Refreshments" A party of all Approaches to English Program participants and NU and T & D Centers' staffs

ELK GROVE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER

NORTHWESTERN CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

Approaches to English

SEMINAR FOR SUPERVISORS

SYLLABUS

September 11 (revised)	"The Teaching of English, Past and Present" Dr. Steve Judy, Northwestern University Planning session for future meetings
October 9	"Basic Issues in the Teaching of English" Dr. Stephen Judy "What We've Done" Miss Julia Hohulin, Dwyer School, District 25 Les Davis, Helen Keller School, District 54 Mrs. Penny Hirsch, Torch Program, District 214
November 6	"Basic Issues in In-Service Education" Everette Breningmeyer, Program Director, CERLI (Process Observer)
(Friday) November 22	"Confrontation: The Indispensable Condition for Changing Teacher Behavior" Abraham S. Fischler, Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
December 11	"Experience, Language, and the Process of Composing" Dr. Stephen Judy Miss Joy Hebert, former teacher, of Evanston's District 65 Laboratory School
January 8	"Innovative Supervisory Techniques and Skills" (A mini-micro lab) Beech Robinson, former Associate Director of T & D (Process Observer)
February 12	"The Role of Language Instruction in the English Program" Michael Flanigan, former Director, Euclid (Ohio) English Demonstration Center
March 12	"Rationale for and Models of Self-Assessment" Russ Spillman, CERLI (Process Observer)
April 9	Cancelled
May 14	Cancelled

KV:ak
4/22/69

ELK GROVE TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT CENTER

"APPROACHES TO ENGLISH"

A program of study and demonstration of methods
and materials in the teaching of English

In cooperation with the Northwestern University English Curriculum Center, the Elk Grove Training and Development Center is sponsoring four programs pertaining to the teaching of English.

One program provides experienced teachers with released time for independent study in action research at the Northwestern Center. Participants are released from teaching duties on a half-time basis from September to June. They have each chosen to pursue special areas of interest in the language arts. Some teachers are studying materials in these areas with the aim of adapting them to their own classroom use. Others are writing original units based on their studies of existing materials. Throughout the school year, they will serve as resource teachers in their schools, sharing the ideas and materials which they have produced with their colleagues.

A second program brings together new, experienced and student teachers, (K - 12) to study methodology and materials related to the teaching of English. These participants are released from teaching duties for half a day twice monthly to attend the symposiums. The first semester meetings are a discussion of basic issues and problems in the teaching of English; the second semester sessions focus on instructional materials with video-taped demonstration classes and teacher presentations providing the basis for discussion.

A third program of curriculum development and leadership training is for veterans of the two programs described above who are presently developing in-service programs in their schools. These participants are released from teaching duties for half a day twice monthly to attend the symposiums.

The fourth program monthly dinner meetings for curriculum directors, language arts coordinators and department chairmen, brings together supervisors from area districts in informal discussion sessions devoted to trends in the field of English

"APPROACHES TO ENGLISH"

and to innovative supervisory techniques and tools.

Additional information about these programs may be obtained by contacting the coordinator, Kathleen Visovatti, at the Training and Development Center, 1706 West Algonquin Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005 (312-259-8050).

APPENDIX C

ELK GROVE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
NORTHWESTERN CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

Approaches to English 1968-69

Seminar for Supervisors
Feedback Form
September 11, 1968

1. What was the most significant event of today's session?

Interesting to talk with other Supervisors.
With my complete unawareness of new trends in English, I was pleased to hear of changes that were occurring in this curriculum to enable the district to begin and progress from there.
Interaction. Discovering a Hamilton Alumnus.
The fact that I with a very limited background can gain much from these sessions.
The discussion relating to effective use of the experiences of the released time people.
Idea of having Symposium participants work up units that would help form a backlog of materials for other teachers and involve other teachers in giving ideas for the units.
The excellent Manhatten which I enjoyed.
Chance to talk to other supervisors.
The give and take of the discussion (the few who did take part)
An interesting talk by Steve Judy.
Exchanging views with fellow teachers about the first miserable week of school.
Remaining professional acquaintances.

2. What was the least significant event of today's session?

None.
The fact that the main speaker did not come.
The lack of participation of many others.
It was not of the greatest importance that the main speaker failed to show up.
Dinner. (I would not eliminate it.)

3. Bouquets

Cocktails!
Very casual and informative.
Relaxed atmosphere, satisfying meal, Dr. Judy's impromptu remarks, well done.
An excellent presentation by one asked to speak at the last moment. (Congratulations)
This was a very pleasant meeting which provided an opportunity to become acquainted and to receive an overview of plans.
The chance to meet and form a rapport with other supervisors from other districts.
Mike Flanigan's remarks.
Dr. Judy's off the top talk. I would like to hear more of this type of information for the benefit of my fellow chairmen. More of the "Current Issues" chats by Dr. Judy with ideas about how to get away from holding the Anthology and lacking from it.
Chance to talk to other supervisors.
Informal atmosphere.
The informality was nice.
Giving us an opportunity to meet and know other supervisors.

Seminar for Supervisors - Feedback form - September 11, 1968
Page 2 - continued

4. Brickbats.

   We didn't accomplish that much this time except to initially get acquainted, which I guess, is all we could expect to have done.
   Put a rope on Bill Rogge's leg and pull him to his appointed meetings.
   Although the program was interesting, I regretted missing Dr. Rogge's speech.
   Dr. Rogge.
   The use of time.

5. What changes would you suggest to improve the program?

   Let's get down to specifics soon!!!
   I would have liked to hear from a few of the members who participated in the program last year. Possibly this could be arranged for future meetings.
   Try not to wait as long as we did to serve the dinner. Time truly is valuable to the majority of people in this group.
   Ask publishers to exhibit and pay for drinks and dinner.
   Keep to schedule.
   More of a seminar atmosphere after the dinner.
   Shorter cocktail hour on school nights.
   Group discussions for exchange of ideas.

KV/ak/9-16-68

ELK GROVE TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT CENTER
NORTHWESTERN CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

Symposium II
February 11, 1969
Feedback

1. I felt that this session was:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	not worthwhile								very worthwhile
Students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
Teachers	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	2	2

WHY?- Students
It helped the English teachers as they got it "Straight from the horses mouth." I got to speak up and say what I thought about the schools and teachers to someone who would benefit from it. I'm not sure I know we said what we meant and you listened to us, but I wonder if you understand us??? It gave the students as well as the teachers a chance to relate their feelings on a social level. It let other teachers of other schools to find out what is going on in different schools. It also let us know what they in other schools do that maybe they can help us. Because I feel that teachers and students should get together and discuss what they do and don't like.

WHY?- Teachers
Rather boring -Group was dominated - too little cross section of students. We didn't gain any new insights. Children complaining about same "old things." Students revealed attitudes and opinions that are seldom expressed to teachers! I enjoyed hearing the students evaluate their teachers - creativity approaches and effectiveness. I can see need for listening to students to better improve teaching. Hearing the viewpoints of the different students was most illuminating. We high school students represented a wide range of interests and abilities and thus their opinions on English classes were very informative. There were two important things said in my group: "I'd like a teacher to teach her subject" and "Something happened to me in my early grades - I do not make good grades." Because we had a direct line to the actual opinions of the students. It was probably more worthwhile to high school teachers - though I feel I did find some points in it.

2. In regard to my participation in this session, I was:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	very inactive								very active
Students	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	2
Teachers	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	1	1

WHY? Students
I felt at ease and said what I thought and enjoyed talking. I said everything I wanted to, and commented on everything we discussed. I was from one of the private schools - the kids from the public schools seemed so far behind -- perhaps if they were treated as 17 & 18 years olds and given assignments befitting this - not the same as in grade school - they would not have the problems they do now. It takes me a while to really feel comfortable and be able to express my opinions. I feel my participation was just average and I knew I could have said more but some of the other students had some of the same feelings that I did.

I felt I had something to say so I said it quite often.

Why? Teachers

Bored. Our group was moderately animated. I was interested in asking revealing questions of students. The candid answers on part of students invited candid questions -- I wanted to find out what really turns on kids in creative writing. Probably more active than I should have been since we were listening to students. Participated as much as I felt necessary. The discussion seemed more pertinent and lively than usual. I enjoy participation in discussion. Because of high interest. Because I felt the high school teachers could better direct the questions in most cases.

3. In this session, I did:

very little open sharing of feelings — much open sharing of feelings

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Students	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	1
Teachers	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	0	1

Why? Students

I wasn't afraid to express myself and said almost everything I knew. I told the teachers how I felt about certain situations. I felt as if, by sharing some of the techniques I recognize in my own school, it might be of some help... I don't know if they were, but... Many of the problems concerned me so I could comment on them and give them my view on the subject. I gave my share of feelings and mostly when one of the teachers asked someone else a question I would continue if the question somewhat pertained to me or my school. I think most of us kids felt the same way and the teachers listening decidedly felt the same way.

Why? Teachers

Because I felt I would only get superficial responses. To combat adolescent negativism. I wanted to take students off the spot when their reactions might have been withdrawal. The sharing was slanted more from the students' viewpoints and feelings. Didn't feel that this was time and place to be "open" - perhaps candid? Most people don't like this "open" sharing since they are too good (often) to listen to someone elses' experiences. No need. Students did all the sharing. Most of us are not intimidated by group discussions; rather we are drowned out by more vocal members who must have their say. It seems to me this is the "price" we should pay for symposium opportunities. Because I wanted honest reactions from the students. When I was asked to respond I did - also I felt I was an attentive listener.

4. My level of conflict in this session:

had very little relevance to issues within the group — was very relevant to issues within the group

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Students	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0
Teachers	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	2

4. **Explain - Students**

It all depends on the people I was talking too - views of my talk. I gave my opinion on the subjects brought up and also brought up a few.There wasn't too much conflict - more so between teachers, than students and/or faculty. Well if I was asked a question I didn't beat around a bush or go off on another subject. What I did and didn't like was expressed by most of us and the questions asked pertained to my conflicts so I feel they were very relevant to the issues within the group.

Explain - Teachers

Don't understand question. The values which the students placed upon the freedom or the lack of it -- the relevance of their curriculum or lack of relevance - served to clarify and clinch some of our conclusions in the workshop from previous sessions. I'm not sure I understand what this means. The issues discussed were most relevant to teacher - student relationship. My conflict was with teachers. The one conflict I felt with the young people was that I cannot accept the caste of those who do not go to college. Because whatever conflict there was, was our attempt to clarify comments by students. Conflict is misleading - I don't feel myself in conflict but at times feel the group in conflict. This meeting was much smoother than the past few.

Bouquets: Students

Couldn't be in such a wonderful surroundings. I don't see exactly what we did - I felt as if I didn't belong, because my training, not only in English has always been difficult - not honors, or advanced courses, but the work was up to us - either we made it or we didn't - there's a certain amount of satisfaction in knowing we did... The kids from the public schools are babied - they do work as jrs. that we did as frosh.- and I wasn't in honors, either. If they can't handle it now, they are going to have one hell of a time when they go on after high school - whether to college, secretarial school, or anything! I liked talking in the small groups rather than the bigger ones. It was easier, I felt more at ease, with the smaller groups. Everyone seemed very pleasant and didn't really contradict anything we said so I felt at ease to give my opinion. I like the program because you could talk so freely and make friends while your doing it. I wasn't afraid to say what I felt and I feel more programs like this would help everybody.

Bouquets: Teachers

To teachers and students for: The general tone and sincerity of both in keeping discussion friendly and in line with developing compatibility between students and teachers. The last few sessions, including this last one, have allowed for more discussion from more people. In our group today every single one participated. There was maximum interest on quite a high level for almost 2 hrs. Am beginning to realize more the need for emphasis upon values in teaching. To whosoever's idea it was (perhaps it was accidental)? to do these at home. It's much better to sit down an hour or 2 later to reflect on what happened during the afternoon. I find the whole procedure at home more pleasureable, I'm more analytic, perhaps more helpful. Great session! Want to hear the play-back of the tape. A stimulating program. Most teachers exhibited both tact and insight in asking worthwhile questions and the kids were wonderful! A good meeting. High school students - delightfully free and open- they wanted to talk - even asked to go back into group so they could do more sharing.

Brickbats: Students

There weren't any thrown at me or anyone else for that matter, I really enjoyed myself and I'm sure everyone else did too. Perhaps some of the difficulty is that some of the teachers present are not even sure of the purpose of teaching - it was evident that they didn't agree but perhaps if they re-evaluated themselves in the light of what education is, realistically, today, they wouldn't have the conflict they do now. I think teachers and students should rotate because at certain times there would be silence and we would not have much to say. A lot of the teachers didn't say much. Only a couple did the most talking and asking questions.

Brickbats: Teachers

Most of the students comments were superficial. One of the most active vocal student participants on how "great" the teachers were at her school upon getting her wraps made the concealed comment to her compassion, "How stupid!" "What a boring session!" One had the feelings she considered our honest probings a "bore" and perhaps us as well. To teachers who try to make students feel inferior with the tone and content of their questions. I don't enjoy filling out these sheets- perhaps I don't understand the importance of them - enjoy filling them out more when I have really enjoyed the session. To those who don't fill these out and mail them back to the T & D. Group-hopping teachers felt they must dominate the conversations of each group they entered, and acted as if they were trying to form the opinions of the students, rather than learn from the. Sessions were a little too long. Comments because a little repetitive

What changes would you suggest to improve the program? Students

That at the end of the session each group would give a summary of what was discussed in their group. Every teacher should attend at least one of these meetings. None, I enjoyed it just the way it was set up and so well conducted and organized. Get the students back to school at the correct time. Have an equal amount of teachers as students. There was much talk about the change in the educational system in the future, etc., Why don't you start some of these changes now, instead of keep saying it's coming, it's coming. You have to deal with education now, it's relevant you can't wait for changes to occur - someone has to start them. Dividing into smaller groups would help more. Have the teachers all have something prepared to ask or discuss ahead of time so that there are moments of silence. It was a great experience for me and I really enjoyed it. There should be more students than teachers.

What changes would you suggest to improve the program? Teachers

Where were the greasers - smaller groups where more interchange could take place (say 2 teachers and 3 students to a group) What happened to our small groups and Mrs. Trouts' presentation? Shifting of people in groups or re-forming of groups after a break. Why can't we have feedback for 10 minutes at end of session rather than taking time to fill this out? Administrators need to hear discussions of this nature, especially to convince those who are committed to "New English" in theory. The students were great, but hardly representative of the student body, re. - get more "grease" kids, more slow and lower teact students. Leas college-bound students. Not many of my kids "just love school," their teachers and everything else related! More of the same. This was much more valuable for me than the Negro lit sessions. I would like to see us spend a session clarifying our goals in our evolving program.

ELK GROVE TRAINING &
DEVELOPMENT CENTER

"APPROACHES TO ENGLISH"

DATE February 19, 1969

SYMP. I X

FEEDBACK INVENTORY SUMMARIES

SYMP. II ____

SEMINAR ____
FOR SUPERVISORS

Input ____

Special Circumstances ____

	A	a	X	b	B
1)	14	4	1	0	0
2)	16	2	0	1	0
3)	4	1	0	1	13
4)	4	0	0	2	13
5)	15	1	1	1	0
6)	14	3	1	0	0
7)	13	4	2	0	0
8)	16	3	0	0	0

Modifications as a result of this feedback

1. Periodic appearances (as group needs and available monies dictate) by "outside experts"
2. In-depth focus on values and teaching for those interested in small group sessions as follow-up to Dr. Harmin's awareness conference
3. Continued presentations and small group sessions focusing on methods and materials in the teaching of English as determined by total and sub group members

BRICKBATS:

None - I was thoroughly involved. Lost in our group - only because we are limited in how much we can do - "just as teachers" - but must keep trying! Uncomfortable chairs. Lets go back to the instruction of English in our schools. Can't see how these ideas can be applied to every subject area every day - not enough time excuse! Part-conservatives are outnumbered and feel lost. None.

BOUQUETS:

Interesting, enjoyable and informative session. None. Leader was great - inspiration high. Fantastic gentlemen! Dealing with a topic we are all concerned with - Human Beings. Great, I can't wait to read "Values and Teaching". Intensely interesting. Beautiful presentation. Wonderful! Mind expanding. I feel richer today. Very interesting and applicable. Excellent speaker - open minded - best session so far. Has terrific rapport with group. Great. Excellent. Good selection. Excellent. Top presentation. Merrill Harmin was tremendous. I really enjoyed the refreshing reinvaluement with students' "selves".

WHAT SUGGESTIONS could you make to improve the training program or its presentation? Help us achieve some of our goals. Lets go back to the instruction of English in our schools. Presentations from authorities in the fields of new educational techniques (such as today). More ideas of activities we can use in classroom. More programs like this one. More of this.

KV:ak
2/27/69

1967

ENGLISH CURRICULUM PROJECT

The data collected for evaluation of the project has come from three sources. These are: (a) MPC's draft of the program; (b) interview with the MPC; and (c) assessment of project director's training. In the interview with the MPC she displayed much enthusiasm for a program that in her words isn't "off the ground." She seemed to have thought through her rationale for the program and presented it quite adequately. However, it becomes very difficult to make any evaluation of this since it is primarily in the infant stage. Several observations, however, seem appropriate. First, there seem to be problems associated with communication. It appears that there has not been sufficient interest stirred outside the Training and Development area as evidenced by the poor response to a series of three invitational letters to school districts surrounding the T & D Center. Second, the project director did not appear to be completely sure of just what direction the project might take. This, she felt, should come from the participants since they would be affected. In her description of the project in the interview the evaluation team member was not altogether convinced that she was ready to accept a non-directive as she seemed to indicate some reservations as to whether the project should completely take a non-directive approach as opposed to a more direct approach to get cooperating teachers to change their behavior about the English Curriculum. Since this MPC is so new and the leadership training at the T & D has not been underway very long or received the problem of direction, a more complete evaluation can not be made at this time.

Recommendations

1. The model project as written needs to have more carefully defined lines of purpose and goals as they relate to evaluation.
2. Since it appears that the project may be directed by the interests of the participants, evaluation procedures may have to be set up after it is underway especially in terms of the objectives that these participants

hope to accomplish. However, some suggested approaches to evaluation:

a) Attitude change as it relates to teachers and the learning process in the language arts.

b) Follow-up study in the schools where the participants are teaching to check implementation of any acquired change in behavior and direction.

c) Comparison evaluations with schools that have not sent teachers into the project for improvement.

1968

ENGLISH CURRICULUM PROGRAM

The Visiting Team was able to examine documents, discuss programs with Coordinators, as well as attend one of the English Curriculum project symposia. At the seminar we were able to speak with involved teachers. They were an exciting group, full of questions, and eager to study both their program and their behavior as teachers. Twenty-six members of the symposium were present.

The program consists of a symposium held at two week intervals involving one representative from each building in the Training & Development consortium. In addition to the symposium there are also ten released-time participants in an independent study conducted through the auspices of Northwestern University.

Symposium members attend eight seminar discussions, six workshop laboratory sessions. Topics include the history of the teaching of English, language in a student, rhetoric, the writing process, literature, criticism, unit construction, and in-service problems. As a result, new programs are developed and introduced into the participating schools. Teachers released half-time to work at Northwestern University engage in a more intensive study of current trends in the teaching of English. Discussions with teachers indicated that the program helped to legitimize their innovative activity in their buildings. The teachers seemed to be more comfortable about testing the assumptions under which they were working, and trying new techniques in their classrooms. Other teachers seemed eager to assess the outcome of their new procedures, and were quite willing to put one contrasting type of instruction against another. The existence of differing views among the participants with respect to basic issues suggested that a great deal could be learned about the teaching of English from carefully defined experimental studies of the outcomes of their innovations.

An important part of the program as planned, is to give the teachers some instructions in principles involved in motivating other teachers to test their assumptions, and to try new programs. The participants in the symposia, are considered as seed people to help develop similar programs within the individual schools. The model of dissemination which seems to be employed here is as follows. A local leader, the MPC, organizes a program in cooperation with university personnel. Together these persons develop a program with local persons who have released-time both for the purpose of attending the symposia, and of working on new programs and sharing their experiences with other persons in their home school settings. This seems to be a productive model. All of the components just mentioned are probably necessary.

A report of the previous year's evaluation contains several suggestions among which were the following:

1. It appears that there has not been sufficient interest occurring outside the Training & Development Center area as evidenced by the poor response to a series of three invitational letters to school district surrounding the T & D Center.
2. The project director seemed uncertain of the direction which the project might take. Therefore, a more clearly set defined goals would be appropriate.
3. It was recommended that evaluation procedures be established as the program got underway. Suggested approaches were measures of attitude change of teachers participating in the program, follow-up studies in schools where the participants were teaching, and comparisons of programs in schools which had teachers involved in the program, and those which did not.

Recommendations

1. The first three recommendations were written with respect to lat year's recommendations. Internal demands for the training were given as a reason for difficulties in accommodating persons from outside the T & D group. However, the project is planning a tea at Northwestern University where it will show tapes of experimental lessons and talk to persons from outside the T & D districts who might care to become involved further. There were questions which seemed unclear as to just how many persons could become involved and the appropriate extent of external involvement. External involvement and dissemination of the English project should be discussed and some clear directions given as to the extent of involvement outside the T & D Center organization. If additional involvement was desired, it would be possible to make additional kind of tests of the effectiveness of the T & D system of dissemination.

   If persons from external districts were brought into the Center for training, it would be interesting to see whether teachers who came from independent districts had a greater or lesser impact when they return to their systems than did teachers who came from schools where a research or innovation oriented super-structure existed. An example of the latter would be the West Suburban Research Cooperative directed by Theodore Storlie.

2. With respect to the second question, a syllabus for the program has been prepared. The program is running effectively. However, the syllabus is not a substitute for a clear cut description of the goals of the project. Therefore, it is recommended that a more detailed delineation of behavioral objectives of the program would be desirable.

3. With respect to the third issue raised in last year's evaluation, it seems that evaluation is not sufficiently represented either in the content of the program being presented, nor does it seem that sufficient attention has been given to the evaluation plan for this project. For example; it seems that more reading and planning could be devoted toward the treatment of major issues in the evaluation of composition. The relationship between the importance of the mode of evaluation, and the message which the students get with respect to what is valued by the teacher is important. Some of the debate related to the development of innovative approaches to evaluating composition could be fruitfully discussed. In addition to reiterating the recommendations for evaluation which were made in the early report, it would be valuable to study through sociometric, and interview methods, the role of the symposium participants in their schools. Were they able to influence their schools, and curriculum, or not?

4. A number of questions have excited the imagination of the participants in this symposium. Certain polarities have developed. For example: some teachers desire to utilize student journals, another group seems to feel that this is not a fruitful approach. Some teachers prefer a restrictive reading list for students, others feel that a wide choice of self-selected reading is desirable. These clear-cut contrasting approaches to the teaching of English make it possible to develop experimental designs for assessing the differences in the outcome of these contrasting programs.

The Evaluation Team recommends the encouragement of carefully designed investigation into the differential outcomes of these contrasting treatments. Design should involve the evaluation staff and appropriate consulting help. The MPC s need to assume responsibility for making their consultative needs known. The program seems to be concerned with the development of an air of thoughtfulness and individual commitment to good teaching. The teachers were impressive, and the staff capable and creative. This program has great promise. The potential for dissemination seems great.

Dissemination conferences will be one step in this direction. On the other hand, involvement and consultative help by program staff as well as alumni of the program, will be important. The ultimate evaluation of the program will perhaps rest on two factors:

1) How many schools will adopt the plan of operation exemplified by the experimental program?
2) How many schools within the T & D district will support and continue the program?

1969

ENGLISH CURRICULUM PROGRAM

Members of the visiting team observed small groups of Symposium I, as they explored topics of special interest, conferred with participants of the symposium, interviewed the project coordinator, and examined materials relating to the program. The approaches to English curriculum is a cooperative project of the T&D Center and Northwestern University.

There are four training sections in the program; each reaching different groups of teachers and supervisors. One section of the program provides released time to study English curriculum at the Northwestern University English Curriculum Center. Ten participants from five districts are released from teaching duties on a half-time basis, for the purpose of developing units and other instructional materials.

The second section of the program is a symposium which permits teachers, who have one-half day, released time, twice monthly, to investigate new ideas in teaching English. Sample topics in the symposium syllabus are: The Teaching of English, Past and Present, Creativity in English, Language Instruction in the English Program. The last semester is devoted to those topics selected by the participants for depth study. Training activities include demonstrations, viewing of video-tapes and presentation of new materials. This Symposium has fifty participants from 8 districts, and four participants from two parochial schools. Symposium II, a third training section includes bi-weekly presentations and workshops for 25 teachers who were involved in the program during the 1967-68 school year.

A fourth training activity of the program is a monthly seminar for supervisors. In this activity information regarding the ideas being tested is presented

presented to the supervisors, followed by a question-discussion period. In addition, such topics as, Basic Issues in In-Service Education, Confrontation: The Indispensable Condition for Changing Teacher Behavior and Innovative Supervisory Techniques and Skills are listed as topics for investigation at these monthly meetings.

Assessment

The range personnel represented indicates that this program has the potential to build more effective working relationships among the several school districts and various outside agencies. It demonstrates one pattern of cooperative effort between a university and public schools. The enthusiasm of the teachers speaks highly of the present working relationship.

Dissemination of information is accomplished in several ways. Participants of the symposium spoke of the informal conversation as being the most effective method of dissemination. Some participants submit written reports of each session to their department chairman. Others report regularly at a faculty meeting. One department has a "share ideas" meeting; another varies the format of the reports, i.e., use role playing and other techniques to express the ideas. In addition, the consultants serve as speakers at teachers' institutes and other educational meetings.

Involvement with Northwestern University, particularly through the Curriculum Materials Center, permits a wider dissemination scope. In fact this becomes a two-way process in which the project profits from the new materials collected by the materials center and, in turn, the materials center receives data on the practical applications of the materials from the field through the participants of the project.

Individual school districts profit from knowledge gained by the faculty member who as a linkage agent relays this information to the district. A project of this magnitude, undoubtedly, would be too costly for any one district. Of great benefit is the released time policy which permits the educational program of a district to continue concurrently with the symposium.

This project has been in operation for two years, during 1968-69. Evaluative data has been collected after each symposium session and each supervisor's seminar. Evidence shows that this data has been used to plan the succeeding sessions and to direct the activities of the consultants.

Reports from teachers involved in the symposium indicate a change in their behavior from a "purveyor" of information to a stimulator for pupil involvement. Activities reported include panel discussions and role playing. It was also reported that less emphasis is placed on rote memory in terms of grammar instruction, which literature shows has been established by research. This gives support to the Model Program Coordinator's stated goals; to bring about a change in teacher role and update the English curriculum.

Involvement of personnel outside the T & D group has been suggested in the evaluation of the previous two years. This continues to be a problem. The Model Program Coordinator expressed dissatisfaction with the response to the tea given at Northwestern University last spring and to the other means of inviting teachers to participate in the program. A new ingredient has been added this year in that Northwestern University has granted graduate credit to the personnel involved. It may be that the requirement of districts to match the funds as well as the scarcity of teaching personnel to serve as substitutes have contributed to the fewer number of participants this year.

Two features of this program, demonstrating patterns of cooperative curriculum development, contribution to the fields of pre-service and inservice education. Bringing together English teachers from various levels and districts provides an excellent opportunity for promoting teacher openness, inquiry and understanding. This is perhaps one of the best known means of establishing articulation. The long-term cooperation of university, public, and private school personnel is also unique. A chronological examination of the documents portrays the developmental sequence of a more systematic program. This evidence of viability is a distinct asset. The enthusiasm of teachers involved in the symposium is a credit to the competence of the coordinator and consultants.

Recommendations

1. A lack of a statement of clear cut goals was noted last year. The statement of objectives included in the current description of the program serves the function of pointing directions for the opportunities to be provided for the participants. This is one of the important functions of objectives. Another function is to serve as a basis for evaluation which requires that objectives be expressed in behavioral terms. Further refinement is needed in this area.

2. There is potential in the "approaches to English Program" becoming a continuous program demonstrating the advantage of several districts working with a university over time with several levels of personnel to improve a curriculum. However as a model to demonstrate an approach either to in-service education or curriculum development there is a vital need to engage in a systematic collection of data, particularly of classroom teachers who have been involved in the program. So far the scattered evaluation does not reveal the dynamics which are working in this program and give the feeling of success to the venture. Systematic data collected within a carefully developed evaluation design would assist in identifying the process and content of the model which makes it an innovative project. It is recommended that much greater attention be given to this aspect of the project.

ELK GROVE TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT CENTER

NORTHWESTERN CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH...A Program of
study and demonstration of methods and
materials in the teaching of English

APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION

______Released-Time Study

______Symposium on the Language Arts I

Submit this form to the English Program Coordinator, Elk Grove Training and Development Center, 1706 W. Algonquin Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, by MAY 1, 1968. The Confidential Evaluation Form from your supervisor is also due on that date.

1. Your Name: *(Mr. Mrs. Miss)*______________________________

2. Home Address:______________________________
(Number) *(Street)* *(Village)*

3. Home Telephone:______________________________

4. School Name:______________________________

Address:______________________________
(Number) *(Street)* *(Village)*

District Number______________

5. School Telephone______________________________

6. Name of your immediate supervisor______________________________

Title:______________________________

Address:______________________________

7. Level of School:

☐ Elementary ☐ Junior High ☐ Senior High

8. List your present schedule of courses taught, professional assignments, etc. *(Do not list components if you teach in a self-contained classroom)*

Courses taught or assignments	Grades	Periods per week

(over)

9. Summarize your years of experience in teaching or related work.

Subjects or Assignments	Level (*elem.,sec., etc.*)	Years of Experience

10. Employment Record - List your places of employment in teaching or related work during the last five years. *(Start with your present position)*

Dates	Name and address of employer	Nature of your duties

11. What colleges and universities have you attended?

Name of institution	Dates attended	Degree	Major	Minor(s)

How many hours of English have you had?____________________

12. Describe any other significant academic experiences you have had in the subject field of English. *(Such as summer programs, workshops, or seminars)*

13. List any curriculum committees, planning groups, etc., you have participated in:

Activity	Your capacity

14. Do you intend to remain in the educational field for your entire professional career?

15. If you could choose any occupational role in the education field, which role would you choose? *(Give the specific title)*

16. What occupational role do you realistically hope to have five years from now?

17. Describe briefly what areas of interest of specific projects you would pursue if accepted into the Program. Attach additional sheet if necessary.

18. Comment on ways in which your school or district could utilize or benefit from the training you would receive if accepted into the Program. Attach additional sheet if necessary.

Signature of Applicant____

Date________________________________

ELK GROVE TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT CENTER

NORTHWESTERN CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH...A Program of
study and demonstration of methods and
materials in the teaching of English

CONFIDENTIAL EVALUATION FORM

(Name of applicant):

____

I am seeking admission to the Released-Time Program ______________

Symposium on the Language Arts Program ______________

offered by the two Centers.

The English Program Coordinator has requested that I forward this Confidential Evaluation Form to my principal, department chairman or immediate supervisor. Please complete this form and submit it to the Coordinator, Elk Grove Training and Development Center, 1706 W. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, BY MAY 1, 1968.

1. Name of evaluator: ______________________________

   Title of Position: ______________________________

   School: ______________________________

   District Number: ______________________________

2. How long have you known the applicant and in what capacity? ____________

   ____

3. Considering all the teachers you have worked with or supervised, how would you rank the applicant on the following characteristics?

Characteristics	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Can't Judge
a. Ability as a teacher						
b. Knowledge of subject matter						
c. Effectiveness in working with students						
d. Effectiveness in working with colleagues.						
e. Leadership potential						
f. Scholastic ability, capacity for growth.						

(over)

CONFIDENTIAL EVALUATION FORM

4. **Provide any comments on the applicant's ability, performance, character, temperament, etc., which you believe will aid the Selection Committee in determining his or her suitability for participation in the Program. Please give specific examples where possible.**

5. **In what ways do you believe the applicant would benefit from participating in the Program. (If the applicant has specific areas of need, please indicate them.)**

6. **Comment on ways in which you school or district may utilize or benefit from the training received by the applicant if he or she is selected into the Program. Attach additional sheet if necessary.**

7. **Signature of Evaluator:**____________________________________

Date:________________________________

Consumers

1967-68

Independent Study Program - 10 experienced teachers from the consortium, representing 5 districts, 9 schools, 5 grade levels (2 junior high teachers from District 15; 1 junior high teacher from District 23; 2 junior high teachers from District 25; 1 junior high teacher from District 54; 4 high school teachers from District 214).

Symposium I - 50 new and experienced teachers from the consortium, representing 7 districts, 31 schools, 12 grade levels. (1 elementary, 5 junior high teachers from District 15; 4 junior high teachers from District 23; 13 elementary, 2 junior high teachers from District 25; 6 junior high teachers from District 54; 1 junior high teacher from District 59; 9 senior high teachers from District 211; 9 senior high teachers from District 214).

1968-69

Independent Study Program - 4 experienced teachers from the consortium, representing 4 districts, 4 schools, 4 grade levels (1 eighth grade teacher and department chairman of junior high from District 23; 1 kindergarten, teacher and school team leader from District 25; 1 seventh grade teacher from District 54; 1 junior high teacher from District 214).

Symposium I - 41 new and experienced teachers and supervisors from the area, representing 7 public schools and 2 parochial school districts, 25 schools, 12 grade levels (2 elementary, 3 junior high teachers and 1 Language Arts Supervisor from District 15; 1 junior high teacher from District 21; 2 junior high teachers from District 23; 5 elementary, 9 junior high teachers from District 25; 2 elementary, 3 junior high teachers from District 54; 2 elementary teachers, 1 assistant principal from District 59; 7 senior high teachers from District 214; 2 junior high and 1 senior high teacher from parochial district.

Symposium II - 29 experienced teachers from the area, representing 7 districts, 17 schools, 11 grade levels. (1 elementary, 1 junior high, 1 Language Arts Supervisor from District 15; 1 substitute junior high teacher from District 21; 3 junior high, 1 Language Arts Department Chairman from District 23; 7 elementary teachers from District 25; 3 junior high teachers from District 54; 7 senior high teachers from District 214; 1 senior high teacher from Sacred Heart School; 2 year college teachers from Harper Junior College; 2 senior high teachers on leave of absence.)

Seminar for Supervisors - 28 Curriculum Directors, Language Arts Supervisors and English Department Chairmen from the area, representing 15 districts, 22 schools, (1 curriculum director, 3 supervisors from District 15; 1 Curriculum Director, 1 Department Chairman from District 21; 1 Department Chairman from District 23; 1 Curriculum Director from District 25; 1 principal, 1 Department Chairman from District 54; 2 Department Chairmen from District 57; 1 Department Chairman from District 59; 2 Department Chairmen from District 211; English Curriculum Coordinator and 6 Department Chairmen from District 214; Department Chairman from District 107; Department Chairman from District 100; Language Arts Coordinator from McHenry, Illinois; Language Arts Consultant from Park Forest Demonstration Center; Demonstration Center Director from Chicago; English Coordinator from Elmwood Park, Illinois.)

INTERVIEW WITH SCHEDULE

1967-68 1968-69

1) What increased knowledge of content have you acquired as a result of your independent study?

2) What changes in attitudes and behaviors as a classroom teacher have you internalized this school year?

3) What effects have you had as a change agent in the field?

FORM A

EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES AND IDEAS: ATTITUDE SURVEY

This is a survey of your attitudes concerning various educational practices and ideas.

Circle the letter which indicates which statement you agree with and to what extent you agree with it.

	A	Strongly Agree With ← A	Slightly Agree With ← a	No Choice X	Slightly Agree With → b	Strongly Agree With → B	B
1.	The curriculum consists of subject matter to be learned and skills to be acquired.	A	a	X	b	B	No subject is more important than the personalities of the pupils.
2.	It is more important for a child to have faith in himself than it is for him to be obedient.	A	a	X	b	B	It is appropriate for teachers to require an additional assignment from a pupil who misbehaves in class.
3.	Students should play a very active part in formulating rules for the classroom and the school.	A	a	X	b	B	Students do not have the maturity necessary for formulating rules for the classroom and the school.
4.	Teachers need special training to develop self-assessment skills if they are to increase their effectiveness in the classroom.	A	a	X	b	B	Teachers are professional people and as such do not need special training in self-assessment in order for them to assess their effectiveness in the classroom.
5.	Most boys and girls who present extreme cases of "problem behavior" are doing the best they can to get along with other people.	A	a	X	b	B	Boys and girls who become behavior problems have probably never really had the proper discipline.
6.	Dishonesty is a more serious personality characteristic than unsocialness.	A	a	X	b	B	Lack of socialness is a more serious problem than dishonesty.
7.	If a pupil constantly performs for attention, the teacher should see to it that he gets no attention.	A	a	X	b	B	A pupil performing for attention is trying to signal the teacher that he has a problem requiring the teacher's individual help.

A

	A	Strongly Agree With ← A	Slightly Agree With ← a	No Choice X	Slightly Agree With → b	Strongly Agree With → B	B
8.	Teachers are professionals, and therefore, are quite capable of assessing their classroom behavior themselves without any help from colleagues, administrators or students.	A	a	X	b	B	It should be part of a teachers contract to agree to periodic assessment of professional skills by administration, other teachers and students.
9.	Children outgrow early emotional experiences as they do shoes and clothes.	A	a	X	b	B	Children experience new emotions which may cover up early emotional experiences.
10.	A student who will not do his work should be helped in every way possible.	A	a	X	b	B	A student who will not do his work should have all his privileges taken away until he does.
11.	Some pupils are just naturally stubborn.	A	a	X	b	B	Pupils learn to be stubborn.
12.	There are too many expectations for teachers to change their attitudes toward students - this is time wasted which could be better spent raising academic expectations of students.	A	a	X	b	B	Teachers must expect to change their attitudes toward students if they are to grow professionally.
13.	Most students have too easy a time of it and do not learn to do real work.	A	a	X	b	B	Most students are overworked and should be relieved of some of it.
14.	Since a person memorizes best during childhood, that period should be regarded as a time to store up facts for later use.	A	a	X	b	B	During childhood children should be allowed to investigate and create things.

	A	Strongly Agree With ← A	Slightly Agree With ← a	No Choice X	Slightly Agree With → b	Strongly Agree With → B	B
15.	Pupils should study some subjects that do not interest them, because this trains them to do some of the disagreeable things they will face later in life.	A	a	X	b	B	Pupils should study only subjects that will build up their self-confidence because self-confident people are more able to cope with disagreeable things later in life.
16.	Assessment of professional skills by students is biased and unreliable, therefore, not valid as an aid to professional growth.	A	a	X	b	B	Student criticism provides teachers with a valid source of constructive criticism for professional growth.
17.	It is unimportant whether or not a teacher is liked by his students. A teacher's first job is to teach subject matter.	A	a	X	b	B	Students will tolerate errors and even occasional injustices in a teacher who, they feel, likes and understands them.
18.	The first signs of delinquency in a pupil should be received by a tightening of discipline and more restrictions.	A	a	X	b	B	A teacher should accept the deficiencies and shortcomings of a student, as well as his good points.
19.	Pupils are more apt to want to learn how to study if they are doing work in which they are interested and which they like.	A	a	X	b	B	Pupils learn to study only by doing some real hard studying, and it should make little difference as to whether or not they like what they are studying.
20.	The classroom should be a self-contained world, undisturbed by outsiders and controlled by the teacher.	A	a	X	b	B	The concept of the sanctity of the teacher's classroom is outdated, invalid and has no place in present day teaching.
21.	Teachers, like university professors, should have academic freedom - freedom to teach what they think is right and best.	A	a	X	b	B	The curriculum should contain an orderly arrangement of subjects that represent the best of our cultural eritage.

A	Strongly Agree With ← A	Slightly Agree With ← a	No Choice X	Slightly Agree With → b	Strongly Agree With → B	B
22. Educational institutions must be sources of new social ideas - education must be a social program undergoing continual reconstruction.	A	a	X	b	B	Schools of today are neglecting the three "R's" and instead are wasting time trying to socialize everyone.
23. Children should be permitted some limited freedom to talk, without the permission of the teacher.	A	a	X	b	B	The only way to prevent chaos in the classroom is to have strict rules concerning talking..
24. Teachers should not do so much talking and explaining to the class.	A	a	X	b	B	Teachers should do more talking and explaining to the class.
25. Teachers who expect to grow professionally must be willing to expose and study, openly and objectively, their own classroom behavior.	A	a	X	b	B	Teaching is a very personal talent one is born with, therefore, teachers cannot expect to gain much from openly exposing their classroom behavior to other professionals.
26. Boys and girls who are delinquent are, when all is said and done, basically good.	A	a	X	b	B	Teachers can do little to prevent delinquent behavior and should spend most of their time helping those students who appreciate it.
27. One of the big difficulties with modern schools is that discipline is often sacrified to the interests of children.	A	a	X	b	B	The goals of education should be dictated by children's interests and needs, as well as by the larger demands of society.
28. All questions students ask should be recognized and considered.	A	a	X	b	B	A teacher should recognize and consider only those questions which come from the deserving students.

	A	Strongly Agree With ← A	Slightly Agree With ← a	No Choice X	Slightly Agree With → b	Strongly Agree With → B	B
29.	Certain facts and knowledge are necessary for the study of all subjects and these facts do not change very much.	A	a	X	b	B	More attention should be paid to student needs and interests than to the unchangeable basic knowledge necessary for the study of all subjects.
30.	Assessment of professional skills by one's colleagues is important if one is to grow professionally.	A	a	X	b	B	To ask one's fellow-teachers for help in self-assessment is to expose one's weaknesses, thereby risking professional reputation and should not be done.
31.	When students fail in college it is because the schools have been too concerned with students needs and interests.	A	a	X	b	B	When students fail in college it is because the schools have failed to develop the students interests and satisfy their needs.
32.	Difficult, hard to understand lessons train the mind for life's difficult problems.	A	a	X	b	B	Lessons should be made easier to understand so pupils won't have to spend much time studying.
33.	In general, people have more character when they were required to live by strict codes of behavior.	A	a	X	b	B	Boys and girls should learn that most of life's problems have several possible solutions and not just one "correct" one.
34.	Assessment of classroom behavior wastes time and contributes little to professional growth.	A	a	X	b	B	It is important for teachers to find ways to assess their classroom behavio if they are to grow professionally.
35.	Education has failed unless it has helped boys and girls to understand and express their own feelings and experiences.	A	a	X	b	B	The true view of education is arranging learning so that the child gradually builds up a store-house of knowledge he can use in the future.
36.	Right from the very first grade, teachers must teach the child at his own level and not at the level of the grade he is in.	A	a	X	b	B	Teaching each child at his own level spoils the child in that it gets him used to doing mediocre work without any standards.

ILLINOIS
TEST IN THE
TEACHING OF ENGLISH

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL
IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Inventory of Teaching Practices

ISCPET

Directions: Below are listed twenty-five fairly common practices in the teaching of composition. Indicate which of these you think are very important, moderately important, of minor importance, and of no importance in a high school composition program. You may feel at times that you are being asked to over-generalize; you might believe that some practices are important for some students and unimportant for others. In general, if you think a practice is important for any group of students, indicate it on your answer sheet.

1. Basing most composition assignments on the student's personal experience.

   a. very important
   b. moderately important
   c. of minor importance
   d. of no importance

2. Assigning most themes on expository topics.

   a. very important
   b. moderately important
   c. of minor importance
   d. of no importance

3. Basing a majority of theme topics on the students' literary studies.

   a. very important
   b. moderately important
   c. of minor importance
   d. of no importance

4. Assigning many impromptu themes.

   a. very important
   b. moderately important
   c. of minor importance
   d. of no importance

5. Having students write research papers.

   a. very important
   b. moderately important
   c. of minor importance
   d. of no importance

6. Stating requirements of length and form clearly.

   a. very important
   b. moderately important
   c. of minor importance
   d. of no importance

7. Having students write on a single, carefully delineated topic.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

8. Discussing the theme topic at length with the students.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance.

9. Teaching outling skills

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

10. Having students outline before they write

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

11. Teaching library skills

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

12. Having students do most of their writing in class

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

13. Allowing students to discuss their papers with each other while they are writing.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

14. Putting a letter grade on themes

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

15. Correcting or pointing out flagrant usage, spelling, or punctuation errors.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

16. Having students revise papers after the teacher has commented on them.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

17. Pointing out errors in structure, organization, and logic.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

18. Holding conferences with students to discuss their writing.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

19. Having students read and discuss each other's completed papers.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

20. Putting out a class newspaper or magazine.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

21. Teaching the modes of discourse (narration, description, exposition, argumentation).

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

22. Teaching paragraph structure (topic sentence, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, etc.).

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

23. Teaching students to write clear, concise, direct prose (the Plain Style).

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

24. Teaching the conventions of academic writing.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

25. Having students write poems.

    a. very important
    b. moderately important
    c. of minor importance
    d. of no importance

APPENDIX D

DIRECTORY OF CONSULTANTS

Everette Breningmeyer
Program Manager
Cooperative Educational
Research Lab.
Box 815
Northfield, Illinois 60093

Jerry Buckler
Principal
School District 59
2123 Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Lolly Buikema
Associate to the Director
for Training
Elk Grove T & D Center
1706 W. Algonquin Rd.
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Glen Elms
Coordinator
Closed Circuit TV/Team Teaching
School District 25
301 W. South St.
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Dr. Abraham Fischler
Dean of Graduate Studies
Nova University
College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

Mike Flanigan
Research Associate
NUCCE
Northwestern University
1809 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Rita Hanson
District I
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

Ron Hager
Training Consultant
Elk Grove T & D Center
1706 W. Algonquin Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Merrill Harmin
Southern Ill. University
Edwardsville, Illinois

Dr. Mel Heller
Loyola University
820 N. Michigan
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Mel Johnson
Coordinator
In-service
School District 214
799 W. Kensington Rd.
Mount Prospect, Illinois 60056

Walter Johnson
Coordinator
Individualized Learning
School District 59
2123 Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Brien Jones
CAM Academy of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Bill Kakavus
Principal
Mohawk School
District 163
301 Mohawk St.
Park Forest, Illinois 60466

Dory Machtinger
Coordinator
Madison Math
Elk Grove T & D Center
1706 W. Algonquin Rd.
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Fred Miller
Coordinator
Social Science
Elk Grove T & D Center
1706 W. Algonquin Rd.
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Sr. Junette Morgan
Research Associate
NUCCE
Northwestern University
1809 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Kevin Murphy
CERLI
Box 815
Northfield, Illinois 60093

Dr. Neil Postman
School of Education
New York University
Washington Square
New York, New York 10003

Beecham Robinson
Northwestern University
1809 Chicago Ave.
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Russell Spillman
CERLI
Box 815
Northfield, Illinois 60093

Terry Tobias
Coordinator
Fine Arts
School District 59
2123 Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Lawana Troutt
Research Associate
NUCCE
Northwestern University
1809 W. Chicago Ave.
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Ron Watson
New York Store Front Schools
New York, New York

APPENDIX E

Professional Books

I. The Romantic Critics

John Holt. Why Children Fail.

Jonathan Kozol. Death at an Early Age.

Herbert Kohl. Thirty-six Children.

Edgar Z. Friederberg. Coming of Age in America.

Paul Goodman. Growing Up Absurd.

II. The Process of Education Today

Jerome S. Bruner. The Process of Education.

William H. Evans and Jerry L. Walker. New Trends in the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools.

Joseph Featherstone. "The Primary School Revolution in Britain"

James Conant. The American High School.

A. S. Neil. Summerhill.

Robert J. Havighurst. The Public Schools of Chicago.

James Squire and Roger Applebee. High School English Instruction Today.

III. The Dartmouth Seminar

Herbert J. Muller. The Uses of English.

John Dixon. Growth Through English.

Paul Olson, ed. The Uses of Myth.

James R. Squire, ed. Response to Literature.
Albert Kitzhaber and James Britton. "What is English?"
Albert H. Marckwaudt, ed. Language and Language Learning.

James Moffett. Drama: What is Happening.

IV. Language and Language Learning

L. Semenovich Vygotsky. Thought and Language.

Jean Piaget. The Language and Thought of the Child.

Kornei Chukovsky. From Two to Five.

A. R. Luria and F. K. Yudovich. Speech and the Development of Mental Processes in the Child.

George A. Miller. Language and Communication.

Emig, Fleming, Popp, eds. Language and Learning articles by Brown-Bellugi, Stemmler, Carroll, Joos, and others.

V. "Creative" Approaches I

J. W. Patrick Creber. Sense and Sensitivity.

Sybil Marshall. An Experiment in Education.
Sylvia Ashton-Warner. Teacher.
Hughes Mearns. Creative Power.

Rollo Walter Brown. How the French Boy Learns to Write.

VI. "Creative" Approaches II: David Holbrook

English for the Rejected
English for Maturity
Children's Writing
The Exploring Word

AWARENESS OF ROLES IN A GROUP

Specific statements and behaviors may be viewed at a more abstract level than the content or behavior alone. They may be viewed on the basis of how they serve group or individual needs. The perception of these patterns of behavior is called a role. Roles may be classified in several ways:

Maintenance Roles - roles which serve to keep the group functioning as a group and only indirectly lead to the accomplishment of the task of the group.

Task Roles - roles which directly aid the group in the accomplishment of goals or in the solution of problems.

Individual Roles - roles which satisfy individual needs but often hinder group progress.

Roles are not played consistently by individuals; they change in different kinds of groups and at different times in the same group, they overlap. Some of the roles frequently played are thumbnailed below:

1. Harmonizer
   a. Attempts to reconcile disagreements.
   b. minimizes conflict.
   c. "Lets you and he be friends" approaches, reduces, tension.

2. Blocker
   a. Interferes with progress of group.
   b. Keeps group from getting it's work done.
   c. Goes off on a tangent.
   d. Reacts negatively to all suggestions.
   e. Cites personal experiences unrelated to problems.

3. Flier
   a. Won't, can't deal with situation.
   b. Avoids confrontation.
   c. Changes subject.

4. Helper-Facilitator
   a. Opens communication by encouraging others.
   b. Is warm and friendly - making it possible for others to make contribution to group.
   c. Clarifies issues.

5. Intellectualizer
   a. Puts discussion on a high plane.
   b. Gives little lectures on theories.
   c. Talks about "Basic Concepts" or "It is Known That."

6. Nonparticipant
   a. Acts indifferent or passive.
   b. Doodler - daydream.
   c. Withdraws from group by using excessive formality or verbally perhaps by whispering to others.

7. Learner
    a. Relies on authority or sanction of others - "My principal says that," or "Research indicates that."

8. Fighter
    a. Agressive
    b. Works for status by blaming others.
    c. Deflating ego of others.
    d. Shows hostility against group or some individual.

9. Initiator
    a. Suggest new ideas.
    b. Proposes solutions.
    c. New attack on problem.
    d. Definitive
    e. Organization of materials.

10. Joker
    a. Clowning
    b. Horsing around.
    c. Joking
    d. Mimicking others.
    e. Disrupting work of group.

11. Dominator
    a. Interrupts others.
    b. Launches on long monologues.
    c. Tries to assert authority.
    d. Dogmatic.

GK/ak/8/26/68

ELK GROVE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER

NORTHWESTERN CURRICULUM CENTER IN ENGLISH

Some Suggestions for Change

The special interest group concerned with The Changing Teacher Role considered areas of change in terms of room, student, group, teacher, and kinds of change as physical, affective and cognitive. The following classifications seemed most useful to us. Obviously many areas overlap. We offer these ideas as suggestions only. They are open to your interpretation, adaptation, or rejection.

Physical Changes in the Room

1. No assigned seats
2. A circle or semi-circle of seats
3. Teacher in group rather than at desk
4. Areas of room equipped and arranged as interest or activity corners (listening posts, with tape recorders, record players, earphones; reading corner with cushions, rugs, easy chairs, books, magazines, newspapers, etc.; visual corner with projectors, films, filmstrips, portfolios, prints, posters, etc.; composing corner with carrols; building corner with work benches, pounding boards, manipulative math materials, art supplies, etc.; game corner with puzzles, checkers, chess, scrabble, cards, etc.
5. Parts of room and walls for displays of student work, interests, etc.
6. Class library (especially expendable paperbacks)

Affective Changes in the Student-Teacher Relationship

7. Let students NOT participate
8. Use student attitude inventories, feedback forms (see handouts)
9. Base discussion of works on student reactions
10. Sit IN groups
11. Joke with students (even when the joke is on you)
12. Be honest with kids
13. Allow choice of assignments within a broad assignment
14. Offer at least one option for every assignment
15. Greet students at door, talk informally
16. Individualize instruction (provide independent study, small group, total group activities)

Affective Changes in the Student-Group Relationship

17. Use small groups to encourage participation
18. Step out of discussions that are going well
19. Let students make class rules
20. Let students come and go freely
21. Take cue from group as to when and how to begin (especially if class is restless or emotional)
22. Let students choose those they want to work with
23. Let students choose interest groups
24. Let students NOT participate

Affective and Cognitive Change in Students

25. Give part of room to display student work, interest, etc.
26. Let students share in their evaluation (see handout, Scottie's thesis provided earlier)
27. Provide inter-grade exchanges (students, projects, student books, tutors)
28. Put a question a day on bulletin board (silly, services, values)
29. Eliminate grades (to the extent possible)
30. Let students decide what to study
31. Let students choose either a test, additional reading or a project on a subject
32. Do not evaluate free reading
33. Use contracts for a unit or period of time (student sets goal, activities for self; confers with teacher periodically)
34. Provide books on same subject at different reading levels
35. Have an idea box for student suggestions
36. Study a block of works at one time rather than individual works one by one (block related in any way teacher and/or kids decide i.e., thematic genre, historical)

Affective and Cognitive Changes in Teacher

37. Ask for feedback from students (verbal-formal or informal; written-questionnaire, inventory, open-ended, see handouts from April 16 session)
38. Tape a portion of a class session; play it back; self-assess.
39. Ask a colleague to act as a process observer in your class over a period of time; assess (see April 16 handouts)
40. Read current books and articles on new attitudes, methods and materials in the field (see handout)
41. Be honest with yourself (especially about your use of authority)

KV:ak
4/21/69

APPROACHES TO ENGLISH

...A Program of Study and Demonstration of Methods
and Materials in the Teaching of English

I. What Released-Time teachers can do for cooperating districts, individually or in teams.

  A. Make available reading material about new trends in the teaching of English.

  B. Disseminate their personally-developed materials.

  C. Conduct chance informal discussion meetings with fellow staff members.

  D. Conduct in-service training programs on grade-level, school or district-wide scale. (See appendix)

    1. Informal optional meetings after school where teachers can exchange ideas and materials in an experimental and supportive atmosphere.

    2. Mandatory meetings involving released-time or credit for after school time where sessions could be informal, with same goals as C.1.

    3. More structed sessions, with reading lists, guest speakers, etc.

  E. Give presentations to teachers and/or administration in own or other districts on new trends in the teaching of English.

II. Topics Released-Time teachers can discuss through C, D, E above.

  A. The changing concept of teaching and of competence in teaching.

    1. The teacher has stopped trying to "teach," he now produces and adjusts conditions which make it possible for his students to "learn."

    2. The child's environment is the real subject matter of his education.

    3. Creative teaching - the fallacy of adopting anyone set of materials as the English "Bible."

  B. Linguistics

    1. Language theory.

    2. Structural and transformational grammars in a traditional framework.

  C. Composition

    1. Involving and motivating students.

    2. The writing process

  D. Methods and Materials

    1. The exploration of short lessons and units rather than one-year sequences.

    2. Ad lib teaching (working from within interest framework of classroom mood, behavior, etc.)

    3. Independent Study.

    4. Cooperative-teaching.

    5. Correlation of language, composition, literature.

Proposed In-Service Programs for 1968-69

1. Voluntary in-service program for new first and second-year teachers and experienced teachers new to district.

   a. twice-monthly

   b. purpose:
      1) dissemination of materials
      2) discussion and formation of philosophy of education
      3) discussion of problems and interests of the teachers
      4) the bringing in of speakers and consultants, if desired
      5) social gathering (though subject-oriented)
      6) working in coordination with other in-service programs, e.g. Mel Johnson's at Wheeling.

   c. personnel:
      1) released-time and symposium people in the building
      2) consultant or team of consultants from T & D
         Note: leader(s) from #1 or #2 above
         attendance compulsory for those mentioned above
      3) other faculty members - invited to attend

   d. place - faculty lounge or other informal area where coffee is available.

   e. procedure:
      1) first meeting mandatory for new teachers (and perhaps teachers new to the district - see below)
      2) present something really exciting (e.g. video-tape, guest speaker), something concrete, stress idea that these informal, voluntary sessions won't be "just another meeting."
      3) before second meeting contact all the new teachers personally urging them to come,
      4) before second meeting perhaps pass out short questionnaire about what kind of help they'd like,
      5) at second meeting be informal, base discussion on their questions, but HAVE MORE MATERIAL and thought-provoking ideas for the teachers,
      6) from second meeting shape program around needs of teachers, bearing in mind that the burden for making the meetings worthwhile rests with the Released-Time teachers or T & D consultants.

   f. examples of content:
      1) speakers - Rita Hanson, Steve Judy, Mike Flanigan, Beech Robinson
      2) tapes - successful lessons (discuss philosophy, techniques)
         critques (laying ground work for self-assessment later)
      3) materials and ideas from articles, but no required work or items of forbidding length)
         a) acquaintance with good books and the professional library (e.g. Holbrook, Fader, Holt)
         b) ditto work of good articles (Moffett, Rohman, Booth)
         c) Northwestern lessons in composition, other Project English materials.
         d) lessons produced at T & D Center - e.g. existential sentences.
      4) discussion of problems facing the teachers
      5) sharing of ideas that they find successful

2. Voluntary in-service program for teachers new to district

    a. purpose:
        1) See #1 on previous page
        2) To conduct building symposiums on the order of the symposium we had this year, but not geared toward production of material.

    b. personnel:
        1) all teachers welcome
        2) leader: consultant from T & D or team of consultants.

    c. content - discussion of issues, methods, etc.

3. Structured in-service program offered for credit

    a. purpose:
        1) see above
        2) to get people interested even if they need more incentive.

    b. personnel - Leader: consultant or team from T & D

    c) content - like symposium content (see above), but with minimal required reading, etc.

4. Speakers or teams of speakers for occasional discussions or presentation of ideas.

    a. all meetings voluntary

    b. discussion of controversial topics

People willing to participate in these programs next year, with their particular interests:

Mrs. Joyce Urban - Linguistics

Mrs. Jeanne Peters)
Mrs. Penny Hirsch) - philosophy of education, trends in
Mr. Gil Tierney) methods and materials.

Miss Margaret McNichols - composition, poetry

KV:jeh
5/20/68